

[17th March 1928]

(b) whether puja which was being performed for a long time has been stopped, and if so, when and why;

(c) whether mahazars from the Hindus of Vellore were received by Government for the handing over of the temple to them for performing puja and other festivals;

(d) if so, how they were disposed of, and if the disposal was not in their favour, for what reasons; and

(e) whether the Government will now hand over the temple to Hindus for performing puja on condition that Adi-Dravidas should have right of entry to the temple?

A.—(a) There is a temple within the Fort believed to have been built in the 13th Century A.D. and said to be of excellent military architecture.

(b) From the Manual of North Arcot district, it appears that worship in the temple was stopped and re-introduced several times in the past. The Government have no information whether worship is now being conducted or not in the temple.

(c) & (d) No mahazar was received.

(e) A report has been called for from the Hindu Religious Endowments Board.

[Note:—An asterisk (\*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

## II

### ELECTION TO THE FINANCE AND THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEES.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I have to announce that, as a result of the elections held yesterday, the following Members have been declared elected to the Public Accounts Committee and the Finance Committee :—

#### 1. Public Accounts Committee.

- |  |                                    |
|--|------------------------------------|
| 1. Khadir Moideen Sahib Bahadur.       | 5. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.  |
| 2. Mr. Chavadi K. Subrahmanyam Pillai. | 6. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayyo. |
| 3. Mr. D. Narayana Raju.               | 7. Mr. C. Gopala Menon.            |
| 4. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai.         |                                    |

#### 2. Finance Committee.

- |                                 |                              |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. T. M. Moideen Sahib Bahadur. | 4. Mr. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed. |
| 2. Rajkumar S. N. Dorai Raja.   | 5. Mr. K. R. Karant.         |
| 3. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar. | 6. Mr. K. V. R. Swami.       |

## III

### MOTIONS ON THE BUDGET FOR 1928-29.

#### DEMAND VII—IRRIGATION—PUBLIC WORKS OFFICERS AND ELECTRICITY.

\* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—“ Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

‘that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 235·17 lakhs under Irrigation—Public Works Officers and Electricity.’

“ Sir, I have been requested by the other side to ask your permission to take up item No. 419 first, because a larger number of Members are interested in that item and wish to speak on it.”

17th March 1928]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I wish to ascertain whether the House will take up item 419, Mr. Saldanha’s motion, as the first item and then proceed with the other items in the agenda as they are. (After a pause.) Since no Member has raised any objection, it will be taken up first.”

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move

*‘for the reduction of the allotment of Rs. 235·17 lakhs for irrigation, etc., by Rs. 100.’*

“ I want to criticise the extravagance in the expenditure and the partiality shown to British machinery and plant at heavy loss to the Indian tax-prayer and to press for the election of a Council Committee to enquire into and report on the alleged extravagances and irregularities and waste, and make suggestions for modifying the scheme and carrying out the scheme in the most economical way and to the best advantage of the public.

“ Sir, of all the items of expenditure in the budget estimates, the costliest is the one in connexion with the Mettur Project. As pointed out by the Finance Member in his very lucid speech in connexion with the Budget, ‘ the most important object of capital expenditure at present is, of course, the Cauvery-Mettur Project now estimated to cost Rs. 717 lakhs (i.e., 7 crores and 17 lakhs). As I informed the Council last year, under a special arrangement with the Government of India we pay simple interest on our borrowings, etc.’ I have got here five volumes of the papers connected with the Cauvery Reservoir Project, published in the year 1925. The estimates then formed of the expenditure on the project amounted to five crores and odd. For want of time I am not able to quote the exact figure, but what I want to remark is that gradually the estimates increased to six crores and odd in 1927. The shifting of the site of the dam has cost several lakhs of rupees, and there have been other reasons which have contributed to the jump in the estimates. A jump of ten lakhs is considered a very small thing by the framers of this enormous project. Now the estimate of five crores and odd has this year jumped to seven crores and odd. We are thankful to the *Madras Mail* for drawing our attention to the enormous and excessive expenditure in this project. It must be pointed out that the ease with which the estimates have leaped from five to seven crores is something which must arrest public attention. What surprises one is that the public have taken so little interest in this enormous expenditure. The *Madras Mail* went so far as to say that this project will not be remunerative but will only be a protective work. Now, I ask, Sir, for whose protection? Is it for the protection of the famine-stricken districts of Coimbatore and Salem? Not a drop of water of this project will go to those districts. The benefit will be derived by a small tract in the Tanjore district, the most prosperous district in the Presidency. This district has never suffered from the throes of a famine. It is a fertile tract and it is proposed to benefit a small portion of that district. Now, on the basis of five crores expenditure it was shown that if a certain rate was fixed on all the lands irrigated by this water, there would be a sufficient return on the outlay. But the question is whether having regard to the fact that the estimates have risen from five to seven crores, it will be remunerative at all. And who knows how many items have been miscalculated or underestimated or even omitted? As a matter of fact, we find now that several items are underestimated; some items might be omitted altogether which are unforeseen. In this connexion I shall read

[Mr. J. A. Saldanha]

[17th March 1928]

to the House two paragraphs from the Budget Memorandum for 1928–29, at page 95.

“ During the year it has become obvious that there will be an excess of perhaps one crore in cost of head works. The dam will have additional height in consequence of the storage permitted by the Mysore agreement; the foundations will go an additional depth, as sound rock in some places is lower than anticipated ; the 1924 floods require additional surplus facilities ; the extra cost under this head may amount to 40 lakhs in all.

“ The subsidiary services were omitted or underestimated in the case of communications, e.g., the Salem broad gauge connexion is a new item, drainage was entirely omitted, housing inadequate in quantity ; and in the case of the coolie camp inadequate in quality, water-works for dam construction were omitted and the sanitation and medical resources were insufficient. Under all these heads there may be an excess of 50 lakhs’.

11-15 a.m. “ Sir, these 50 lakhs and 40 lakhs are spoken of as if they are little items of few rupees, annas and pies. But, I may sound a note of warning in this House that if Government estimates are prepared in this manner—and it is very likely that these estimates will one day rise to 10 crores—we cannot say to what state our finances will be reduced. If you do not get sufficient interest to cover this enormous outlay, we shall have another Back Bay muddle and a scandal. We know the financial straits the Bombay Government has been brought to and how a rich province like our sister Presidency is now suffering as a result of the wasteful and extravagant expenditure, if not fraudulent expenditure on the Back Bay project. The result is that in Bombay money cannot be found for even the most obvious necessities of nation-building items and they have now to reduce the expenditure at every step, so that it will take years before the finances of the Bombay Government are brought to a sound equilibrium. Are we not going to face in this Presidency another Back Bay scandal in connexion with the Mettur project ? It is therefore of the highest importance that such a catastrophe should be avoided. I do not wish to dwell much upon the various items of expenditure. In fact we have got few details. On more than one occasion I asked the late hon. Law Member to place before us the details because these old estimates contained in these five volumes have to be discarded altogether and new estimates have to be framed. We are absolutely in the dark and I therefore press the hon. Member to take us into his confidence and to place before us these revised estimates. But this request has been persistently rejected and we are absolutely in the dark as to the details and even in regard to the main details of this extra expenditure of more than 2 crores that will be involved. I understand that the estimates have not yet been sanctioned by the Secretary of State. What I wish to press is that this House should be taken into confidence by Government, that the revised estimates should be placed before this House, that a Committee of this Council should be appointed to go carefully into all these items after visiting the Mettur works and then to go into all the details of the expenditure. After this committee has carefully studied the revised estimates they should be discussed by this committee at a meeting at which the hon. the Finance Member as well as the member in charge of this subject should be present, and if necessary they might scrap some of the items of expenditure and also see if other items also exist or may occur which have not been foreseen, and ought to be anticipated. For instance, we have got the Geological department of the Government of India on which Government have spent lakhs of rupees annually. If this Geological department

17th March 1928]

[Mr. J. A. Saldanha]

had been consulted in the very beginning that could surely have satisfied the Government as to where the embankment should have to be built up. Instead of that Government sent its own Engineers who knew nothing about the geology of the place with the result that they pitched upon a site which afterwards the Geological department found to be altogether unsuitable after Government had spent some 20 lakhs over the original site. Then they had to change the site and selected another place. Even in that new site you will find that the depth was originally misjudged. Why were not proper diggings made and the various levels of bed-rock found at the very outset? That ought to have been done long ago and not at this stage. This sort of miscalculation is unpardonable in a department which lavishes money on a vast establishment of trained men. If the Government of Madras has not got the men qualified for this purpose, they ought to get men from outside or they could have consulted the Geological department from the very beginning and found out at what depth the safe bed-rock could be found. This is not the only instance of miscalculation. If I may make mention, there is, for instance, the Tuticorin Harbour works. From 40 lakhs they jumped to 60 lakhs. I brought an adjournment motion on account of the 60 lakhs. Now quietly we have got a press communiqué from which it will be seen that it has come up to 1 crore and 60 lakhs. So is the case with the other projects. I do not now wish to attribute fraud and dishonesty because I have not got grounds for that. But I may rightly charge the authorities concerned with gross negligence bordering on fraud and dishonesty. If a man is engaged in framing the estimates in a few months, there will be leaps from crores to crores if in three years they have jumped from 5 to 7 crores. How long shall we go on like this and how long the Government should go on deluding us with these wrong estimates which will bring us to the brink of the precipice of insolvency and bankruptcy of the Government. Thereafter when they want money they will have recourse to extra taxation. We are already overburdened with heavy taxation, especially this Presidency more than all other provinces and we have been crying hoarse over this overburdening of taxation. Are we to be faced with another scandal like that of Bombay or a scandal worse than that? Sir, I can only press upon the Government to take us into their confidence and place before us the revised estimates and to see that every one of the Members is furnished with copies of the revised estimates and to appoint a committee of 12, the members of which may be suggested by the leaders of different parties. This committee should be able to go to Mettur, examine the works in the light of the printed estimates, and we want explanatory notes, because we are all laymen in this matter, and those explanatory notes should be placed in our hands so that we shall have time to study them in the light of our inspection of the place. After that a meeting should be called for discussing the several items, I hope, before the estimates are sent to the Secretary of State. With these words, Sir, I hope the Government will take up the suggestion of mine with the consent of this House."

\* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—"Mr. President, Sir, last year at the budget time I had the honour to move a motion for a cut of Rs. 100 on this very same question. We are now at the end of another year and we find more and more of bungling in regard to this Mettur Project affair. As a matter of fact in this Presidency there are districts which have no irrigation facilities as compared with Tanjore. Tanjore can claim irrigation for about 66 per cent of its cultivated area; next comes East and West Godavari which

[Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao]

[17th March 1928]

may be taken together and which have an irrigated 50 per cent of cultivated area; Kistna can claim only 30 per cent; Kurnool can claim only 5 per cent. Under these circumstances any wise Government should have carefully thought before it launched upon a project of this nature.

11-30  
a.m.

"To say that the idea of this project has been in existence for over a century is not to adduce the proper reason as against the argument that we are making in this House. Apart from that consideration, Sir, what has happened with regard to this project itself? Three years have passed. Preliminary expenses have been incurred and expenses have also been incurred on establishment—expenditure of a very heavy nature. What is the result to-day? The resultant factor of these three years of work is almost a deadlock for some time to come. First, there was an error with regard to the site. Next, there was an error with regard to materials. Surki mortar was first of all contemplated. Estimates were prepared on the basis of the use of surki mortar. Later on, experts who have always existed there and whom Government could always consult came into the field and then the estimates jump up by crores. And now there is a fresh discovery. The Finance Department, or the Accountant-General, I do not know which, has just now discovered that after all many things which ought to have been estimated for were not included. A great deal of expenditure, intentionally or unintentionally, consciously or unconsciously, was suppressed and therefore the rate-payers are now called upon to contemplate an expenditure of above seven crores, while the original estimate was five crores. But, does it stop there? Are we going to stop there and is that to be the end? No. It does not end there. The reports that have been circulated to this House are not certain whether there would not be a *little* more of rise in expenditure on this Mettur project.

"Now, Sir, the Law Member on the floor of this House told us during the last budget that manual labour would be employed to the largest possible extent. But, if you look at the report, you will find that manual labour has been very greatly supplanted by machine labour even for purposes of earth work. I do not want to enter into any great details and trouble the House, because the details have been there before the House. If you look at the Appendix to the Financial Committee's Reports, you will find a tabulated form wherein you will find works and the amount of money spent on works all these years. That amount comes to a very little percentage of the whole amount that has been spent on the undertaking. After three years, if this is the state of affairs, and if we have to wait for the introduction of machinery till about the end of 1929,—that is what is in the reports, I believe, that is what is hoped for, not even certainly expected,—if we have to wait for machinery till about 1929, when are we to see the end of the undertaking and when does the Government propose to get into other undertakings which are more emergent, which are crying for help for a number of years and which find absolutely no place in the budget of this year? For instance, Sir, the Tungabhadra Project, of which a great deal was made by the ex-Law Member who was so sympathetic towards the Ceded Districts in his speeches, does not find a place, nor is there one anna of provision in this year's budget, so far as I can see. Probably, there is some hidden provision of some hundreds or a few thousands of rupees. The Finance Member will be able to explain to us what hidden provisions have been made for purposes of investigation. What is the amount of money that has been wasted upon the

17th March 1928] [Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao]

project at Mettur during the stage of investigation? Has investigation with regard to the Mettur project ended now or has it not? It does not appear as if the investigation has ended, because to-day they have discovered certain things which were not discovered sometime ago. Is there any guarantee that there are no other things which would be discovered in any future year for which estimates have not been made and provision has not been made? I do not exactly see where this project is going to land us. It may land us, as some members were afraid, in a muddle like the Backbay Muddle in Bombay. I probably do not mind a little waste because we are wasting a great deal of money under the present system of Government in so many ways. I do not mind a little waste of money if we can be assured that that would not have a deleterious effect upon the future programme of the country. All the experts put together, working all these years, have bungled in such a serious manner in the matter of the Mettur project that if this project failed to satisfy the experts, there will be serious results. There are those experts who rule finances and experts who rule the destinies of machinery. Those experts who rule finances who would merely say: 'Look here, there was the Mettur project, which we did our best to bring to a success but which has failed. Therefore, we must proceed with care. It may take a little more time, may be 20 or 25 or 50 years, to investigate into other matters like the Tungabhadra project or the Kistna project. We have to go slowly. We cannot go too quickly or too fast.' All these sorts of things, the finance experts may possibly adduce against further programmes. That is what we are most concerned about in this matter. It is a wastage not only for the present, but it is a wastage for the future of this Presidency. Therefore, Sir, this motion has been made asking for the appointment of a proper committee to go into the matter and watch the expenditure on this Mettur project.

"In the budget last year, Sir, I referred to this very idea of a committee. Then we were promised so many things: we were promised so much of information instalment by instalment. But we are to-day in a very much worse plight. I therefore hope and believe that the Government which must have all this time realized that if they trust merely to experts, be they experts of finance or be they experts relating to machinery, they would be landed nowhere. They would be well-advised to take the suggestion of men who can give them with some commonsense. Experts, no doubt, are required but expert advice ought to be managed by commonsense and commonsense is the more important material, when you are doing the work of a whole country, and even in works of a technical nature, commonsense is a necessary complement to expert advice. If the Government declines to concede that much of place to commonsense, I am afraid they would have become the thorough faddists for which they have already established a reputation."

\* Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, I oppose this motion. I listened very carefully to the speech of my hon. Friend, Mr. Harisarvottama Rao. He seems to think that the Tanjore district is swallowing up a great deal of the money available for irrigation. Sir, I have with admiring eyes gazed on the Godavari and the Kistna deltaic systems. When I beheld them, I could not help saying to myself that Sir Cotton who, with his Tanjore experience, wanted to make those districts as fertile as Tanjore had succeeded in actually making them far more fertile than Tanjore. I do not, however much I may envy them, grudge my friends of the Telugu districts those irrigation works which they may rightly boast of and other irrigation

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar] [17th March 1928]

works which they have every right to see realized. If the Tungabhadra scheme has not been taken up, if there has been long delay, I certainly sympathize with them in condemning that delay on the part of the Government and in passing severe criticism with regard to the dilatory proceedings of the Irrigation Department and the Government with regard to a scheme so very necessary for the material prosperity of the large number of people of those places. While, therefore, I sympathize with them, at the same time, might I request them to take some pity on us, the ryots and landholders of the Tanjore district for the simple reason, in the first place that lands in the Tanjore district are fast deteriorating? I challenge not only experts on agriculture but also the officials in charge of agriculture in the district to deny my statement. Not only is there deterioration, but also the ryots have to pay such high revenues. If my friends in this Council would consider this, especially the question of the revenue collected from the landholders of the Tanjore district, they would, I think, think twice before they attempt to scrap a scheme of this nature. Tanjore, Sir, yields the largest revenue proportionately to other districts.

"Sir, my friends referred to this scheme as something which was prepared long ago, but that antiquity gives no prescriptive right for any scheme to be introduced. May I, therefore, in all humility, submit for the consideration of my friends that this scheme prepared by Colonel Smarts was long overdue, and that there is nothing very extraordinary about it; all the ryots and landholders of the Tanjore district, all men of commonsense men who are certainly capable of making very good suggestions in such matters and of using their common sense, according to the advice given by my hon. Friend, I say, Sir, that all of them will be satisfied if they have or if they are assured a regular supply of the normal quantity of water required for irrigation in the Tanjore district. We ask for no more than that this project will give us this assurance, that it will ensure a regular and unfailing supply of water for our lands. We do not want more or anything in the shape of a luxury or superfluity. If more lands are irrigated, if more lands are brought under wet cultivation, revenues would certainly increase and members whose duty it is to consult the greatest good of the largest number will certainly take pity on the people of the Tanjore district and not deprive them of the beneficial results which are expected to flow from the materialization of this Mettur Scheme.

"Sir, my friends have pointed out that several mistakes were made by the department. I am not an apologist of the Irrigation or the Engineering Department. There are experts and experts. Their estimates and calculations are sometimes at fault. They make mistakes. Mistakes are often made, have been made and, I fear, will be made in future also. Because mistakes are made and there has been waste of money here and there,—I myself have sometimes pointed out how there has been such a waste of money—it does not follow that the scheme should be scrapped or abandoned.

"Sir, I may also point out for the information of my friends who oppose this scheme that there is every possibility, provided the Government is prudent and cautious, of recouping a great deal of the money invested in this enterprise. Sir, in the Punjab, I think 35 per cent of the expenditure incurred by Government in meeting the cost of the land purchased for irrigation schemes was realized.

17th March 1928] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar]

"I think if only the Government would sell their lands not now when people have not yet realized the full consequences resulting from the conversion of these lands into wet lands, but a short time before preparations have been completed for opening the work or when the time is ripe for the introduction of the scheme, I am sure they would realize not only 35 per cent, but at least 40 per cent of the expenditure involved in paying the cost of the lands. There is also another source of revenue, Sir, which the Government may rightly tap and that is the revenue from fisheries. There are about 1,000 tanks at least in Pattukkottai which may be made to yield some revenue, in return for the benefit they get of a supply from the Mettur channel. There are also a large number of tanks in the Tanjore taluk; the revenue collected by or resulting from the activities of the Fisheries department in regard to those tanks will certainly go a great way to cover up a certain percentage of the expenditure incurred. Then, Sir, there is the question of the enhanced rates. If these steps are taken by the Government, I think there will hardly be any necessity for fixing so high these enhanced rates. They might even have to be cut down. Therefore, considering the fact that this is an experiment, a remedy which is vital to a district which has hitherto been considered to be the granary of South India, a district where with the aid of this scheme lands will become twice or three times as fertile as they are now, lands which are only to be properly irrigated to yield a large return not only to the people who toil and labour there but also to the Government who are very clever in exploiting their resources, considering all these facts, I think my friends will do well, however much they may criticise the scheme, never to oppose it, nor delay its execution by recommending the appointment of a committee."

\* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI :—"Mr. President, Sir, I do not suppose it is the object of the mover or those who supported this motion to condemn the scheme altogether as unproductive or unremunerative, although a word or two here and there from the mover of the motion, the hon. Member from South Kanara, might have suggested that the scheme might prove another Backbay scheme and that he was not in favour of the scheme as being altogether productive. Sir, I have been expressing my opinion very often on this matter, that, in order to consider whether a scheme of irrigation is really productive or unproductive, the standards that have been set to us by the Government are altogether false. Instead of taking into account merely the revenue that the Government will derive from the irrigation scheme as is now being done, the real test to see whether a scheme is really remunerative or not from the point of view of the country should be to find out whether the value of the increased produce due to the irrigation scheme is likely to be not equal at least to the amount that may be necessary to meet the working expenses and the interest on the capital. This standard is really different from the standard now set by the Government, viz., the actual revenue that the Government may derive on the scheme. The principle that I have been seeking to set before this House and the Government is really the proper test to find out whether a scheme is remunerative or not. To express in terms of figures, if the produce that is now got in the Tanjore district for which the Mettur scheme is now intended under the present circumstances is only worth Rs. 10 crores, and if by bringing into existence the Mettur scheme the value of the produce in the Tanjore district is likely to be Rs. 12 crores, then there is a decided balance in favour of the country by means of

11-45  
a.m.

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

[17th March 1928]

this scheme, to the extent of Rs. 2 crores. If the working expenses and the interest on the capital necessary to bring into existence this scheme is less than Rs. 2 crores, then I maintain that the scheme is not unremunerative at all even if the revenue derived by the Government is less than two crores. Having that standard in view, viz., the real gain to the country as a whole, I believe that almost all the schemes that are now condemned by the Government as unproductive and unremunerative from their point of view, would not be so from the point of view of the country. No doubt, there are difficulties from the point of view of Government, but the country as a whole will not lose if my test is applied. The problem as to how to realize the money from the people that are particularly to be benefited is more a problem of taxation and has nothing to do with the question whether the scheme is remunerative or not. That is why I say that in considering the Mettur scheme, I have not the slightest doubt that the scheme will prove productive and remunerative from my point of view. I am in favour of a scheme like that; but that is quite different from condemning the scheme from other points of view. On more than one occasion in this House the representations of a number of representatives from the various districts which really have a better claim to the water of the Cauvery than the Tanjore district, have been disregarded by the Government. Districts like Trichinopoly, Coimbatore and Salem which are now practically dry, for them the use of the Cauvery water would be more beneficial than for the Tanjore district. Their claims seem to be quite justifiable, but the Government have disregarded them. Again, Sir, from the point of view of the ryots of the poorer districts like the Ceded districts who have been crying for big schemes like the Tungabhadra and the Kistna schemes, they have suspicion that if once a big scheme like the Mettur scheme is taken up earlier, then their own schemes will be held up, if the loan of money that can be got from the Government of India be utilized for other schemes and that afterwards the Government will come and say: 'Your scheme is quite alright, but where is the money available. The money that we can get from the Government of India has already been spent on the other schemes.' That consideration also does not seem to have been given enough attention by the Government. Thirdly, Sir, the way in which the estimates have been prepared; and the increases in them due to various considerations have all been brought to the attention of the Government, and I believe the Government will take care to see that proper estimates are prepared and to see also at the same time that unnecessary wasteful expenditure is not incurred in this connexion. It is my strong conviction, Sir, that a scheme like this, whatever its present effects on the finances of the country may be, will ultimately prove remunerative from the point of view of the people of the country, and as such, it has my strong sympathy. So, it is not the intention, I believe, of the Members of this House to give up this scheme altogether, as I strongly hold that it will certainly prove remunerative in the long run. If it does not prove remunerative, from the point of view of the Government, if it is not possible to realize, to begin with, enough revenue to meet the interest on the capital charges and working expenses, I am sure the scheme will prove remunerative later on by the increased production that is certain to accrue from a scheme like that. If I have succeeded in my attempt to convince the Government of the test that I have placed before them to know whether a scheme is remunerative or not, then there is really a chance for districts like the Ceded districts to get some such schemes of irrigation. I hope that this House will express its consent to this scheme, and at the same time, if need

17th March 1928] [Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

be, condemn it from other aspects of view by which it is not really meant that the scheme should be given up but only modified."

\* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, since the time when the Mettur project was sanctioned, several things have happened which tend to throw a doubt as to what this scheme is ultimately going to be. Whether it is in fact going to be a productive scheme is, I think, a matter of doubt. There are several aspects of the matter which I should like to refer to. Firstly, the question of the distribution of ayaicut under the scheme is a matter that has come in for a good deal of criticism in this House. The question, for instance, whether the whole of the water that is impounded in the Mettur reservoir should be taken to Tanjore and set apart entirely for irrigation in the Tanjore district is a matter that requires very careful consideration."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" If the hon. Member has no objection, he may come to one of the Opposition Benches and address the House, using the microphone."

\* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" Temporarily, Sir. (Laughter.)

" The Committee that was originally appointed is supposed to have gone into the question of the best distribution of the new ayaicut. But for reasons, some of which have been explained and some not, whatever the conclusions of this Committee might have been, the Government have decided now that the whole of the new irrigation should be in the Tanjore district. I think, Sir, that if this Committee did come to that conclusion or whatever might have been the reasons that might have led the Government to decide finally that the whole of the new irrigation should be in Tanjore, this House, I believe, would never accept this decision. The claims of districts like Salem and Trichinopoly, not to speak of Coimbatore, have often been pressed in this House, and the hon. Member in charge of Irrigation has told us that experts are against a redistribution of the ayaicut, contrary to ideal distribution. Take, for instance, Sir, the case of the Salem district which is a district badly provided with irrigation sources. Famines have been frequent there, and while Government have very often been trying to find new sources of irrigation, they have so far failed in their search; for the obvious reason that the existing irrigation sources in the district have all been practically utilized and the only source the Government can turn to if they are really anxious to find out a new irrigation source to Salem must be the Cauvery river. And if, therefore, the Government are going to come to a final decision that not a drop of Cauvery water more than is at present utilized in that district is to be given from the new Mettur reservoir, it is a matter of the most serious moment to that district.

" For this reason particularly that in a district which is liable to frequent visitations of famine there is a necessity for new irrigation schemes, it is very regrettable that Government should come to the decision that not a drop of Cauvery water from the present Mettur project is to be utilized in these districts. Well, this House may admit that the Government should look to the revenue side; but I submit there is a higher aspect than the revenue side, namely, the humanitarian side. (Hear, hear.) That is, apart from the question of revenue, Government is bound to build irrigation works for the district of Salem to prevent the recurrence of famines from which it has been suffering so that the inhabitants of that district may have a share of the general prosperity.

[Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar] [17th March 1928]

"The case of Trichinopoly is not so bad, but still next to Salem this district must receive consideration. I shall for the present moment not refer to Coimbatore which is likely to receive development of large schemes of irrigation from other sources. For instance, we have the Bhavani from which it is possible to develop new irrigation. So that if the Government decides not to give a single drop of water from the Mettur project, this district will have scope for development of irrigation from these other sources. It follows therefore if you look at this question of the ayaecut distribution from the Mettur project from the standpoint of the requirements of the districts, surely the districts of Salem and Trichinopoly must be given the first preference.

"With reference to the question of opening new canals for the districts of Salem and Trichinopoly we have been told in this House that Government experts have given their opinion that the cost of the alignment of these canals will be altogether so excessive that Government could not consider that scheme. With reference to that hon. Members representing that district have often said that they are prepared to pay much higher rates of revenue as compared with those proposed for the Mettur project. As for the question of levels there is no difficulty (hear, hear) in the districts of Salem and Coimbatore. The earliest proposal for the utilization of the Cauvery water was from an anicut at Nerinjipet for irrigation in the Salem district. The next scheme was for a reservoir at Nerinjipet. Thus in both cases the idea was for irrigation within this district. And the idea of irrigation for the Tanjore district came up at a later date.

"With reference to the possibilities of revenue development there is one aspect of the matter I should like to deal with. The proposals for second crop in the Tanjore district were prepared by Mr. Wallace, who is now one of the Justices of the High Court of Madras, when he was put on special duty by the Government of Madras. His estimate is now many years old. I believe if the matter is enquired into carefully at present, Government will come to a very different conclusion. His estimates are illogical and inconsistent. I think the percentage of second-crop lands in the Tanjore taluk is 45 per cent, in the Kumbakonam taluk it is 38 per cent, in the Nannilam taluk it is 25 per cent, in the Mannargudi taluk it is a little less and none in the other taluks. I do not know on what basis Mr. Wallace drew up his estimates. When such is the case I would be loath to accept it. It is primarily a question of supply of water available. I note also that Mr. Wallace has gone into the question of manure. He lays special emphasis on the difficulty of obtaining manure in this district. But it passes my comprehension how this difficulty can be overcome in some taluks and not in others. It is obvious that for second crop there is no outlay on works. So that if for instance a proposition is put forward that if Government instead of utilizing money to bring under cultivation new first-crop lands they were in for a proportionate area of second-crop lands where single crop is already raised it follows that extra revenue will be got with a smaller outlay. I say by all means reduce first-crop lands but increase second-crop which means larger revenue to the Government; and if therefore Government spent any sum on new canals in Salem and Trichinopoly it will be compensated by the receipt of larger revenue in second crop in Tanjore.

"There is one other point I would mention before I close; and that is about the recent decision for the use of cement. We have had a good deal of discussion about this. The hon. Member in charge of Irrigation at one of

17th March 1928] [Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar]

the previous meetings of this Council promised to place the whole matter before the experts of the Government of India. I believe it was done but as far as I am aware the question whether cement ought to be used in preference to lime was never placed before these experts. I challenge the hon. Member in charge of irrigation to contradict my statement. I once more say that so far as I am aware the question referred to the experts never included the fundamental question whether cement should be used in preference to lime, but the question referred was whether a cement dam could be built. (Hear, hear.) Sir, our whole experience in this country has been that lime is a satisfactory material for the construction of dam. We have had in this country construction of dams previously, dams much higher than the Mettur dam, and they are still standing and not one of them has failed. (Hear, hear.) When I looked into the notes of these experts some of them have been almost apologetic, and some seem to plead that instead of cement lime is a more satisfactory material.

"Then, Sir, about the reasons that have been put forward on behalf of the use of cement. It has been stated that if cement is used the period of construction would be shortened and that the shorter the period of construction the sooner the realization of revenue from the land. The Government experts first of all expected an increase of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  crores in revenue; this came down subsequently to 2 crores and the final estimate is about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  crores. I don't know whether the revenue experts have given their opinion; and when they come to bestow thought upon it the anticipated increase will dwindle to nothing.

"With reference to the question of cement there are many aspects that require consideration. It is said that by the use of cement the construction of the project will be accelerated. If the acceleration of the construction falls to the ground, as it must, the Government cannot get any extra benefit from the use of cement; but the cost of the project will go up possibly by about 2 crores of rupees. But if there is no corresponding increase in revenue the case of cement fails. About the acceleration of the completion of the scheme I believe experts have not admitted the possibility of acceleration. They doubted the working programme, the number of working days, the daily hours of work and the estimates based on these. They have said that they felt that the data on which the proposed acceleration of the scheme was based are wrong. They also criticized the provision for machinery. On the floor of this House, Sir, the question of the use of machinery has been discussed. And from my own personal experience I can say that so far as the use of excavating machinery in this country is concerned we have a sorry tale to tell. (Hear, hear.) It has been in all cases not possible to carry out work at competitive rate with manual labour. Our estimates for earthworks and excavation have always been higher in the case of imported machinery than in the case of manual labour.

"If in addition to this we include depreciation charges and things like that we will see that in a country like ours where manual labour is available cheaply the use of machinery is premature. Machinery has been successful in other countries where manual labour is very costly. Speaking from personal experience I should say that in every case where excavating machinery has been used the cost has been much larger than the cost with manual labour. Then, Sir, if in addition to the estimated provision a large addition is made, as I believe it has been recommended by the experts, the

[Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar] [17th March 1928]

estimates will be considerably increased and I do not know what the ultimate cost will be. It is for that reason I say that when the final estimates come to be made up for the use of cement and machinery the scheme might be found not to satisfy the requirements of a remunerative project. All these points require very careful examination and I hope that the hon. Member in charge will recognize that it is not even at the present day too late to go into the whole question again so that the State may not embark on a project of so large a magnitude and so costly, which at the present moment seems to run the risk of involving the State in annual recurring losses. These matters require very careful consideration and I hope the hon. Member in charge will, in any manner he likes, cause such examination of the matter to be made as will safeguard the higher interests of the State." (Applause.)

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ Mr. President, I am glad that my hon. Friend from South Kanara has given me an opportunity of expressing my views on this matter. This has been before the House a number of times and the last occasion when this came up here was when the question of cement versus lime was discussed on an adjournment motion brought forward by my hon. Friend, Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar. It was pointed out then that the use of cement would make the dam stronger and would speed up the construction by two years. I then asked whether lime or cement was used in other dams in India and whether the samples of lime and the materials from which lime was manufactured were sent to the experts for chemical examination, and I was told that the lime which could be manufactured from the materials available near the dam in this province would not be suitable for the construction of the dam.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ Who gave the reply ? ”

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ The hon. Member in charge of the department.

“ Now the hon. Member, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, says that this point was not submitted for examination. That is a matter on which I can say nothing.

“ There are one or two matters mentioned by my hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, with which I am unable to agree. He said that instead of extending double crop cultivation in all the taluks which are now irrigated why extend wet cultivation in non-deltaic parts. My hon. Friend said that if it was possible to cultivate 45 per cent of wet land with double crop in Tanjore taluk it ought to be possible to cultivate 45 per cent in Shiyali taluk also and the question of double crop depends only on the availability of water. But what about the availability of labour, the fertility of the soil ? If the soil in Tanjore taluk can stand a double crop, the soil in the Mayavaram taluk may stand double crop. It also depends on the availability of manure. There may be more waste lands from which green manure can be got and greater number of cattle in Tanjore taluk than in the Mayavaram and Shiyali taluks and therefore there may be more manure available in Tanjore taluk than in the other places. All these things must be taken into consideration in the case of double crops.

“ Then he said : ‘ Why extend wet cultivation in Pattukkottai taluk instead of realizing the same from the Tanjore, Mayavaram, Kumbakonam and Shiyali taluks ? ’ But how much of the total cost of the scheme is spent

17th March 1928] [Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar]

on the head works up to the Tanjore limit and how much of it is spent in digging channels to bring it to the Pattukkottai taluk? If I am convinced that the cost is out of all proportion to the total revenue I shall agree with the view of the hon. Member, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. I think that at the most only about 2 crores out of the 7 crores of the total estimate is spent in the channels in the Tanjore district, and for that we are able to irrigate 300,000 acres. It is a very profitable thing to irrigate 300,000 acres at an extra cost of 2 crores.

“ My hon. Friend said that the details regarding the levels of the districts of Coimbatore and Trichinopoly which showed that it was not possible to irrigate those districts with this water were wrong. I would be glad to know if really the details placed before this House were wrong. On a previous occasion in the committee appointed by the Government of which my hon. Friend from Coimbatore was a Member . . . (Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar: You too were there) came to the conclusion rightly or wrongly . . . ”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ Did it ever come to that conclusion ? ”

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ On a former occasion when this matter was discussed I said that I would be the last person to deny water to Trichinopoly, Salem and Coimbatore if it was possible to take water there. But the opinion of the engineers then was that it was impossible to take the water there owing to the level. Supposing it is possible I am quite willing to admit I am wrong.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ You are wrong to-day.”

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Order, order.”

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ On a previous occasion it was pointed out in the House that it would be possible to irrigate Coimbatore and Salem districts with an extra cost which would bring the water rate to Rs. 32.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ Rs. 27 to 29.”

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ As regards Trichinopoly there was no definite conclusion arrived at and it was said it was unnecessary to investigate it further. If now after further investigation it is found possible to irrigate those districts, as a representative of the Tanjore district. . . ”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ Not to-day.”

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ I would be the last man to deny that.

“ The resolution of Mr. Saldaña for the purpose of appointing a committee to go into the whole question and come to a conclusion—personally I should be very much in favour of and I like to support it.”

\* Mr. T. M. NARAYANASWAMI PILLAI :—“ Mr. President, Sir, we are all glad that Diwan Bahadur Arogyaswami Mudaliyar has been released from the silence imposed upon him by the office he held and has been able to place the result of his experience and knowledge of engineering at the

[Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai]

[17th March 1928]

disposal of the House. (Hear, hear.) I am not going to trouble the House with the question of cement and machinery ; but I shall content myself only with referring to the distribution-side of the scheme and the great loss sustained by Trichinopoly on account of the denial of water to that district. Now the distinguished engineer has told us that it is not impossible to give the benefits of the scheme to Trichinopoly. I have taken some pains to go into the history of the scheme and I find that as far back as 1902 the people of Trichinopoly were crying for water under this scheme. Even in 1910 when the scheme was finally investigated, of several alternative schemes the one that would give water to Trichinopoly was preferred. Trichinopoly was always promised the benefits of the scheme. I am at a loss to understand why the opinion of such a distinguished engineer who investigated the scheme has been passed over in favour a scheme which confines the benefits exclusively to Pattukottai. I have also read the report of Mr. Wallace and I find no arguments therein compelling the restriction of the benefits of the scheme to Pattukottai alone. Taking all the criteria which Mr. Muthiah Mudaliyar has laid down, namely, the fertility of the soil, availability of labour and manure, nearness of markets, certainly the scheme which includes Trichinopoly is preferable. As a matter of fact doubts were entertained in 1924 when this scheme as it is at present—was first laid before this hon. House for approval. The hon. Member in charge then distinctly made a promise that the alignment of the channel would be settled in consultation with the Committee to be appointed by the House. That was, if I remember right, in August 1924. The Committee sat for two years and the claims of Trichinopoly were pressed before the Committee. Early in March 1926, before the dissolution of the last Council the Committee met with the hon. Mr. Campbell, the Member in charge of the subject in the chair and it was decided that at least 50,000 acres should be given to Trichinopoly. Investigation was ordered and investigation was made and no engineering difficulty was found ; no revenue difficulty was found. While for the whole scheme extending the benefits to Trichinopoly the rate came to Rs. 15-8-0, for the Pattukottai Scheme alone the rate was Rs. 15. In spite of these favourable circumstances I do not see why the Government have not thought it fit to have an alignment of the canal in such a way as to benefit Trichinopoly. In December 1926, on the report of the Chief Engineer stating that as far as Trichinopoly was concerned there was no engineering difficulty, Government passed an order. The hon. Member from Coimbatore tabled an adjournment motion and I pointed out that at least so far as Trichinopoly was concerned the decision of Government was unsatisfactory. The hon. Member promised to investigate the question with the help of some experts, I believe from Poonamallee. The experts and the investigation are yet to come. I press upon the Government that it is imperative that the investigation of the scheme at least with regard to the distribution side of it should be undertaken at once.

12-30 p.m. “The Government will kindly appreciate our difficulties. It is a case of now or never. With regard to Coimbatore it was stated that they might have the benefit of some scheme or other later on. With regard to Salem the hon. Member in charge stated that it was imperative ; with regard to Trichinopoly also he said that it was imperative. If we once let slip this opportunity we could never have that opportunity. So it is I request the Government that a proper investigation may be made. With regard to Trichinopoly because there are no engineering difficulties and because the

17th March 1928] [Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai]

revenue forecast is alright I implore the Government to undertake distribution of water and see that the benefits of the scheme are given to Trichinopoly."

\* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I shall try to confine myself to a few words, because I wish to give an opportunity to other hon. Members to speak on this point. I appeal to the hon. the Irrigation Member not to commit himself or the Government to any conclusions as arrived at by the Government. Because I know that his personal conclusions will probably be against the scheme from his long experience of the districts. If he sticks to his original idea and to those we may put forth here to-day, and if he agrees to follow them he will be able to arrive at a very satisfactory conclusion. I am also glad that the hon. Member Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar has been able to put forth his views to-day. Those views are not those of to-day but were expressed by him long ago. This scheme was prepared several years ago. So far as the history of the scheme is concerned it is a very old scheme and it had its origin in the year 1834. The idea then was, as was very well stated by Mr. Mudaliyar who is our leader in this matter, to have a number of anicuts across the Cauvery between Cauveripuram, the northern extremity of Coimbatore district and Bhavani 35 miles off. The idea was to irrigate Coimbatore and Salem districts and to give water for second crops in Tanjore district. This idea held good till the end of that century. Then various representations were made. The idea afterwards was to have a dam constructed at Murangapettai 29 miles from Erode. The Engineer then in charge stated that Salem and Coimbatore might be given water for irrigating 50,000 acres of land, and this, Sir, is the land between the river and the mountain ridge on each side. Afterwards in 1905 or 1906 the present scheme was started to have a dam 26 miles from Bhavani which is itself nine miles north of Erode. So far as distribution of water is concerned I do not want to say anything more, except that Mr. Mudaliyar was a little partial against Coimbatore. The hon. Member Mr. Muthiah Mudaliyar stated that the committee agreed to give up the scheme of irrigating Coimbatore and Salem districts. I challenge him to say whether the Committee came to that conclusion. The Committee with the hon. the Irrigation Member, the Secretary of the Department, the Chief Engineer and others came to the conclusion throughout that water to irrigate 50,000 acres should be given to Salem and Coimbatore. The only thing that was stated at that time was that it would be very costly. As was stated by my hon. Friend Mr. Narayanaswami Pillai it was decided that water to irrigate 50,000 acres should be given to Coimbatore and Salem districts and about 100,000 acres to Trichinopoly, and  $1\frac{1}{2}$  lakhs of acres to Tanjore which I believe has got 8 lakhs of irrigated area. It was stated then that the whole cost of giving the benefit of the scheme to Coimbatore and Salem and reducing the quantity of water to be given to Tanjore would be only half a rupee more per acre. All the ryots bordering that area said through their representatives and through various mahazars submitted to the Government that they were prepared to pay whatever the cost might be. We were told that we would have to pay Rs. 27 and 29. We took the word of the Government, toured along to villages on the borders of the river, held meetings and sent mahazars with a large number of signatures undertaking to pay increased rates. We were prepared to pay Rs. 27 because we have no water. This particular plot on both sides of the river has no well irrigation either unfortunately, because the soil is rocky down below. Therefore we

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [17th March 1928]

were prepared to pay Rs. 27 and Rs. 29 per acre provided we got water. I appeal to the hon. Member in charge to read a long letter written by me to the hon. the Law Member wherein I have given reasons, economic and otherwise, why preference should be given to Salem and Coimbatore. I do not want to repeat the reasons given in that letter as to why we should have preference. The hon. Member Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar said we were against the scheme. He said that his districts Tanjore and Trichinopoly should be benefited. If it is a provincial and national scheme we do not want that it should be sacrificed on account of the interests of any particular district. In 1924, the Secretary of State insisted on a scheme being prepared and a resolution passed by this House in favour of the scheme. The hon. the Law Member said then that a resolution should be passed. He thought perhaps that we would object to it on some ground or other, or that one district did not get the benefit of the scheme. It was practically agreed then that the ryots whose houses and lands were to be submerged should have first priority. The hon. the Law Member said 'we will appoint a Committee; we will abide by the decision of the Committee'. Under these circumstances we were prepared to agree to this resolution being passed; it was passed unanimously. What was done? Breach of trust again. A Committee was appointed; a number of meetings were held; experts were consulted; we arrived at certain conclusions. All on a sudden we received a Government Order when we got up from our bed one fine morning to the effect that the experts said that it was not only very costly but it was impossible. It was then that I moved an adjournment motion. Another promise came then from the hon. the Law Member representing the Government. He said 'no, no; we are not finally committed to this view.' He had a Government Order to the effect that the Chief Engineers of Bengal and of Bombay will be appointed as members of a Committee to deal with such question and he said he would appoint a Committee on that matter. It is more than a year now and the Government forgot everything about it. The memory of the Government is very easily erased. The Government finally say that they had finally committed themselves to the previous scheme and thus they ignored the claims of the ryots of Trichinopoly and Salem and Coimbatore. They say that they could not give even one drop of water to those districts. The hon. the Law Member said 'we will give you the Upper Bhavani project which will irrigate 200,000 acres of land although the Engineers say that the scheme would be very costly.' Our mouths watered then; but we got no water actually. Hon. Member Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar described the way in which Revenue Officers condemned schemes that had been practically approved by the experts. It was agreed previously that the Upper Bhavani project was feasible and that it could be worked out. Mr. Priestley, I.C.S., was appointed to report on the financial side and said 'all these schemes are wrong from the beginning to the end; opinions of the expert Engineers are wrong and the Revenue experts who said that they would get large revenue are wrong'. The hon. the Law Member said that he would ask Mr. Priestley or some other officer to reconsider the matter. That promise also made on the floor of the House was not kept up. Therefore I would ask the hon. Member in charge now not to make any promise now. The Secretariat is able to do more things than the Legislative Council. That is how the Upper Bhavani project which was to benefit Coimbatore was condemned. All these facts show that we want water, that we want a Committee to see whether the scheme is sound financially and otherwise. Various places for the construction of the dam were fixed; finally

17th March 1928] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

the experts said that the present site was the safest place. My hon. Friend, Mr. Saldanha, showed me some books to-day. In the course of a previous discussion I pointed out that this very particular place which has been selected now was once chosen and condemned. The present site of the dam is one mile above Mettur. They did not find out the weakness of the old site of the Mettur dam until the heavy floods of 1925 occurred."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The hon. Member said that he would give time for other hon. Members to speak; I do not fix any time limit; I only remind him of his promise.”

\* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“This is a case in which we are very much interested. We have to see whether the scheme is financially and otherwise sound. If the dam is breached at any time, there will be much danger to the villages nearby; it should be guarded against. Where is the guarantee of the Government for that? Their own experience has proved false to them. The previous site was considered to be the safest till the floods of 1925. There may be another flood in 1931. It may show that the present site also is not safe. Therefore it is very desirable that the site itself should be carefully selected with the advice of the experts, if necessary. My hon. Friend, Mr. Koti Reddi, pointed out how we should consider whether one big scheme was productive or not. I agree with him. Such schemes become useful after decades and even a costly scheme will be useful to the country after some years.

“When we were told that by importing machinery the work would be completed earlier, we were satisfied. We are told to-day that it would take two years more to get the machinery. Sometimes the machinery that is got does not work well. I know these facts being interested in some industrial concerns myself as our hopes are not always realized. Therefore a committee consisting of some members of this Council and impartial experts should be appointed. I have no objection to the Chief Engineers of other Provinces being on the committee. Big officials are inclined to think that machinery obtained from their own country and their men are the best under the sun. I am of course against that view. Anyhow we are prepared to have some committee appointed. It would be stated that there would be delay by so doing. We have to wait for two years for getting machinery. Delay is sometimes inevitable. I do not think that the Government will lose anything by taking the commonsense point of view and appoint a committee with one or two experts who will go into this question carefully.

“So far as my district of Coimbatore is concerned, Sir, it has had several troubles. Lands were purchased and leased out on a rental of 4 per cent on the purchase price but now it has been increased from 4 per cent to 6 per cent. The introduction of machinery is to replace labour and labourers driven away from their lands are now to run away from the district itself. The men are driven away in fact from these places, landless and penniless. All these are the benefits of expert opinion. Sir, expert opinions are never to be trusted. The tyranny of expert opinion is really dangerous and full of risk.”

\* Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI :—“Sir, it was the day before yesterday while the Excise demand was under discussion, an hon. Member from my group said that drink was a solace to the depressed classes. Sir, I do not agree with his statement, but I may say at once that the Mettur Project which

[Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai] [17th March 1928]

has been wisely launched by the Government at a time when the country is faced with famine ; it has really afforded a certain amount of solace to the members of the depressed classes. Sir, the Government Administration Report for the year 1926-27 states that emigration to Ceylon and other places from India has increased by 50 per cent. But due to the restriction of rubber production, the outlet has stopped and consequently the labourers are returning to India. A special officer has been appointed to look after their interests. I would appeal to the hon. Member in charge of this portfolio to kindly give facilities for the depressed class members to be employed on this important project. I am not here to discuss the details of the scheme. But I may say that instead of exporting a large amount of machinery from England and other places, wherever possible depressed classes and other labourers may well be used for these purposes as a matter of encouragement.

“ Again, Sir, the monopolising of the rank and file of the services in the project has caused a certain amount of discontent amongst our fellow-brethren. For instance, men working as supervisors after ‘having had several years’ experience in laying tramlines and such other things, have been sent away from the service without notice from the Cauvery Project headquarters. I would appeal to the hon. Member in charge to see that the interests of the depressed classes are safeguarded in this respect.

“ Coming to what fell from my hon. Friend, Mr. Narayanaswami Pillai, I am of opinion that, if a canal is constructed at Kattalai and water distributed to Pattukkotta and other adjoining taluks, it will give facility to the depressed classes people who are having small holdings there to get water for their dry lands. It will also afford facilities for people who own a certain amount of holding in that particular district.”

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Sir, I beg to associate myself, respectfully, with my hon. Friend from Trichinopoly in his well-deserved congratulations to my friend representing the Central Districts, Christian, on the freedom he has acquired to place his well-known experience of irrigation matters at the disposal of this Council, freedom from officialdom, and the use he has made of it this morning. He has given the Government, Sir, with the moderation which is characteristic of him, a scathing indictment of the manner in which the project is carried on. As for the project itself as such, there is nothing in the hon. Member’s or any other Member’s speech against it. But, undoubtedly, every one in this House has the right to criticise the manner in which the project is being carried on.

“ Sir, I have the privilege of representing no district in particular in this House ; therefore I can afford to be impartial on this question. Sir, I represent, among others, the districts which are involved in the possibilities of the project, viz., Coimbatore, Salem, Tanjore and Trichinopoly. Therefore I agree with my hon. Friend, the Member for the Central Districts, Christian, in his statement, that the Government in framing a programme of Government irrigation works must not be governed merely by considerations of revenue, but must also take into consideration the humanitarian claims. A Government ought not to exist merely for the purpose of continuing to increase revenue returns. It must provide water for the people who because of want of water are actually starving or are living on starvation limits or are otherwise emigrating from this province to other places and suffering untold miseries in those outlying places to which they go. Sir, the criticism is

17th March 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

rightly levelled against the Government for the methods they pursue in these matters. There must be a programme for at least 20 or 30 years of major irrigation works in this province to irrigate all parts of the province and secure for them just and equitable treatment at the hands of the Government, according to a time-table. Instead of that, Government only want a section of the people to be benefited while other people are starving without a drop of water. This action of the Government is not likely to command the universal approval of this House or the people of this Province, especially when Government want to invest large capital outlays on these schemes. The real point which my friend made and which has not been so far met, is the mentality of the Government of Madras. My hon. Friend with the responsibility of one who till the other day was a Member of the Government charged the Madras Government with breach of faith. Sir, my hon. Friend, the Law Member, made a speech on the last adjournment motion in the course of which I was led to believe, and many other Members were under that impression, that the experts deputed by the Government of India who looked into the question had advised the Madras Government that cement was superior to lime. But, Sir, my hon. Friend has let the cat out of the bag to-day. My hon. Friend said that he was speaking from memory. I have since verified it by looking into the speech which Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar made on behalf of this Government.

" And then, Sir, he said :

' When this topic was raised on the floor of this House some months ago, I said,—and I am glad to see that the statement has been repeated—that I did not see any reason why the most careful enquiry and investigation should not take place as to the relative merits of cement and lime especially when I realized that many dams had been constructed in this country and elsewhere out of lime, that the question of using cement concrete and its advantages in such construction would be very carefully scrutinized and that a decision could be reached only after the most careful balancing of advantages. Although the actual decision was reached when I was not here, I may say that the decision in which the Government of Madras have participated is a decision which cannot but be regarded as inevitable.'

" After referring to what happened between this Government and the Government of India, he adds—that is the conclusion which the hon. the Law Member then expressed and it bears out what my hon. Friend has just now said :

' All these four Engineers have come to the unanimous conclusion that the modern policy that has been pursued in every country in the world which has been embarking on projects of this magnitude is to use what they call cement concrete instead of any other materials.'

" This is irrelevant.

' That is the recent practice ; not only that ; there is what may be called the time factor also. It is calculated that four years' saving is effected by the choice of cement concrete as against lime. It is not necessary for me to go into details of this subject. There may be other occasions for that, but we have been advised in short, advised by a body of experts whose competence cannot be gainsaid, that the time factor is undoubtedly in favour of using cement.'

" Therefore on the main question as to whether the Government of India was consulted on the relative advantages of using cement as against lime, my hon. Friend's statement stands uncontradicted. Why then was it supported by this clever speech of the late Law Member, if the Government of India were never consulted ? But whether they embarked on the use of cement without their submitting their proposals to the Government of India or not, I do not know what they have done with regard to the specific object of the adjournment motion, as to whether they would have cement manufactured or supplied by Indian firms or whether they are going to have it from outside this country.

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[17th March 1928]

"My hon. Friend made another point, namely, that the use of excavating machinery has always been a mistake, considering the low wages of the labourers of this Province and that that has always been his experience. I think that the Government must therefore have considered whether it was right to import excavating machinery. It was a double wrong to this country in that it means the sending to England of our hard-earned savings and the depriving of unfortunate poor coolies of some small wages which will go a long way to relieve their starvation and poverty. It seems to me to be almost criminal on the part of Government to waste money in this way, when human material is plentifully available and comparatively cheap. If the Government have any commonsense, they will listen to the advice of the hon. Member who has had a long experience in the Engineering department and knows what he is talking about.

"Then, Sir, as to whether this project is going to be a paying concern or not, the less said about it the better. Sir, there is one paragraph in Appendix II of the Budget Memorandum which is condemnatory of any Government, which has any sense of shame about it. But this Government has no sense of shame. 'During the year it has become obvious that there will be an excess of perhaps one crore in the cost of Headworks.' I ask hon. Members whether the Government is justified in keeping a day longer any officer of the department who cannot frame an estimate correctly. 'The dam will have additional height in consequence of the storage permitted by the Mysore Agreement; the foundations will go an additional depth, as sound rock in some places is lower than anticipated; the 1924 floods require additional surplus facilities; the extra cost under this head may amount to 40 lakhs in all.' Forty lakhs! a sum we cannot conceive of. Then again: 'The subsidiary services were omitted or underestimated in the case of communications, e.g., the Salem broad-gauge connexion is a new item, drainage was entirely omitted.' What are Engineers for? And the Commissioners and Collectors! What are they paid for?

1 p.m.

"'Housing is inadequate.' Why? 'Coolie lines are inadequate.' Why? With the water works abandoned, are the people to live on nothing? The sanitary and other minor amenities are insufficient. Under all these heads there is 50 lakhs. Forty plus 50, there is 90 lakhs. These are the experts for whom we are asked to pay year after year.

"Then, Sir, I have only one word to say with regard to my hon. Friend, the Second Minister. Not very long ago on the 2nd November 1927 my hon. Friend replying, before he changed his mind, to the then hon. Law Member said: 'Is he in a position to place before this House the considerations and the arguments both in favour of lime and cement and who were the exponents of lime and cement?' Let us see what were the various arguments that were urged by the experts before the Government of India and what were the materials on which they came to the conclusion. It is a question of the relative strength of lime and cement. Were the experts in a position to see the materials before they came to any conclusion and may I ask whether the lime stones and the lime that can be manufactured with lime stones that were available near Mettur were exhibited and sent for the examination of experts'? But if my memory did not fail me I thought my hon. Friend just now said that they had to give the opinion on the lime available in Madras and therefore they came to the conclusion. . . ."

17th March 1928]

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—"In my speech I repeated the very same thing."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"Either my knowledge of English is defective or my friend's powers of expression are defective. I heard my hon. Friend distinctly say that the opinion of the Government of India was based on lime that could be manufactured in or near Mettur and the materials available were such that preference should be given to cement. If he is still of the same opinion I am glad and I hope he will vote with us."

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—"I said, I wanted further investigation in the matter."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"I will come to that presently. There was one scathing criticism of the arguments of the then hon. Law Member in favour of the time factor, that magic phrase, for which he advocated both importation of excavation machinery and also the use of cement. Further my hon. Friend said on that occasion, 'The Law Member has said before that if machinery is used then the time will be diminished by two years.' Then the hon. the Law Member said that if cement is used the time will be reduced by four years. Are we to understand that it will be completed before 1929 and the lands in the Tanjore district will be getting full water in 1929? I cannot put the case higher than that. As regards my hon. Friend's voting it is a matter between him, the Reserved side and the Governor. I want to point out to the House that the motion runs thus: 'For criticizing the extravagance in the expenditure and the partiality shown to British machinery and plant at heavy loss to the Indian tax-payer and for pressing for the election of a Council Committee to enquire and report into the alleged extravagances and irregularities and waste, and make suggestions for modifying the scheme and carrying out the scheme in the most economical way and to the best advantage of the public.' If my hon. Friend votes for it, I shall be delighted. But I want to point out to him that in the Joint Committee report they have laid down that the members of the Reserved half or Transferred half should neither speak nor vote against one another. I therefore respectfully ask him to resign and cross the floor of the House, rather than wait for the ignominious dismissal. If he is going to be true to his words let him cross the floor of the House and not any longer betray the Congress to which he belonged." (Hear, hear).

\* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"Mr. President, Sir, this discussion began with the criticism of the revised estimates and a desire for more information as to the details of the revised estimates. It then gradually developed itself into a general debate on the whole question of the merits of the project, whether other projects should not be preferred, whether this project could not be of a different nature to that planned and so on. I would suggest that there is not much practical use in going into all these questions because this is a project which has been sanctioned and is in operation and its main lines—although details may be altered—can hardly be now altered.

(A voice: 'Has the dam been sanctioned?')

"In its essentials, it is a storage project designed to store water which would otherwise run uselessly to the sea and to supply through the existing works of the Cauvery delta or rather both through the existing works and the additional channels taken from the same head works to a larger area as

[Sir Norman Marjoribanks] [17th March 1928]

planned. The object of the main project is two-fold. It is to supplement the existing irrigation so as to enable two crops instead of one crop to be grown and to irrigate a larger and fresh area of 300,000 acres in Pattukkotta taluk. That is one aspect of it. You must not also forget that a storage work is necessary in the interest of the existing delta itself as has also been explained in the report on the project which is available to the House. The question has been raised whether distribution to other districts should not be a new variation to the scheme. That matter I was under the impression had been dealt with here and outside some considerable time ago. I have in my hand a report of the committee which discussed this matter and that contains a statement comparing the various proposals made by the committee and reviewed by the Chief Engineer showing what the cost would be of the additional schemes devised to supply water first to Trichinopoly, and then to certain areas of Salem and Coimbatore and then the order of the Government which stated as follows:

'The proposed extensions of the Cauvery irrigation so far as they relate to the Salem and Coimbatore districts are beset with practical difficulties. The schemes have not been surveyed. This means delay which will add heavily to the capital cost by way of interest. High water-rates would be necessary to make the project productive. Terracing would be required as the country proposed to be irrigated in those districts is undulating. Soil is poor and would need much preliminary work before the land is fit for cultivation. The growth of irrigation will be very slow and the duty much less than in the delta.'

"To irrigate additional land in the Trichinopoly district does not present similar engineering difficulties but it would require a rate of Rs. 20 per acre to bring in a productive return on the extra expenditure necessary of Rs. 42 lakhs. The Chief Engineer after careful consideration of the several aspects of these extension proposals advised that they should be abandoned. I would respectfully submit that it is rather late to reopen the matter. (A voice : 'A promise was made by the Law Member during the adjournment motion.') It is not right to suppose that the Government is in any way opposed to the proposition that we should consider the claims of other districts that need irrigation. It might have been a question whether it would not have been better to take up a project on the Tungabhadra river. But at the stage we now have reached it is surely too late to revise radically the Mettur project. As a matter of fact we are not dropping the Tungabhadra project. Investigation on it has begun and will certainly be proceeded with. But as regards this particular matter of irrigating either Salem, Coimbatore or Trichinopoly I do not know what further considerations we can adduce for a change of the Mettur scheme to supply water to areas which were not contemplated in the original project. As regards Coimbatore, of course, the House is aware that there is proceeding the investigation of an irrigation scheme from the lower Bhavani. It has not presented the difficulties that have rendered it impracticable to proceed with the upper Bhavani project. At the same time I do not wish to be regarded as barring local consideration of any workable proposal that can be devised. It is the practical difficulties of taking a channel from the storage reservoir to Salem and Coimbatore that stand in the way. I do not at all see how such arrangements can be made with the project as at present designed. After all it is a question for the engineers and if any practical suggestion is made I will give it my consideration.

"I will now come to the increased estimates. The additional cost involved in these revised estimates will of course make the cost of making any supply to the Coimbatore district also greater."

17th March 1928]

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ We will pay for it.”

The hon. Sir NORMAN MAJORIBANKS :—“ Before I come to the variations in the estimate, there is another matter referred to which I should like to say a word about, and that is the question of cement. Statements were made by two hon. Members, one quoting the opinions that were given by the engineers and the other quoting from the speeches of my predecessor who was in charge of this particular portfolio. I do not want to suggest that Mr. Arogyasami Mudaliyar’s inferences were without basis, but what he inferred was certainly not the impression that the opinions of the Engineers’ Committee conveyed to my mind. (Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar : ‘ Not all of them, but one or two.’) To my mind the engineers distinctly advocated the use of cement. The opinions, however, have been published in full and hon. members can peruse them and judge for themselves.

“ Now, with regard to the variations in the estimate, the Mover of the Resolution was very indignant and said that these variations should have been foreseen, and he stressed that these matters should be looked at with common sense. Well, with such sense I possess, Sir, I do not see how anybody could have foreseen that there would be such a flood in 1924 which is reported to be the heaviest for a century past. (Voices : ‘ Oh ! ’) There having been such a flood, it is surely our business to make provision for the safe discharge of the surplus water due to such a flood, and it is for that reason that the surplus, which has been provided on the left bank being found to be insufficient, another surplus has been provided on the right bank. Well, that means considerable additional cost. As for the foundation, I am not an engineer myself and cannot say how far it ought to have been possible to foresee extra depths in places. For the foundations, the usual plan is, I believe, to dig trial places here and there and it seems to me that even after you have done that you may find places where the foundations will have to go deeper. (Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar : ‘ Therefore there is the risk.’) There is risk in all these matters, and we must be prepared for the further expenditure and unexpected charges whenever we undertake a project of this magnitude.

“ As regards the drainage which was referred to with some indignation, the drainage referred to is the drainage of the camp in Mettur and not the drainage of the irrigation system. We have adopted at the instance of the Director of Public Health a far higher standard of sanitation than was contemplated by the original framers of the estimates. I do not wish to lay undue stress on the point, but the additional expenditure under this head is due to the fact that we have adopted the highest standards in this matter. The Director of Public Health insisted on more efficient arrangements and the Government are glad to take his advice.

“ The railway is a matter on which it is doubtful to say whether it should be regarded as a part of the cost of the project. The estimates require careful scrutiny to see what should be taken as real additions to the cost of the project as being necessary to the work. The Government have not yet reviewed the estimates in detail and satisfied themselves as to the necessity of each item. Some of the details have not yet been completely reported to the Government. I am told the complete revised estimates are now being printed ; they have not been examined yet by the Government. The revenue estimates have reached the Government Secretariat but no member of the Government has actually seen and considered them. What I propose to do is, as soon

[Sir Norman Marjoribanks]

[17th March 1928]

as the revenue and expenditure estimates have been examined by Government, to send copies of their detailed estimates of expenditure and revenue to every Member of this Council. But it is difficult to understand these estimates as they appear on paper. You can understand them only if you go to the actual works and see what each item is meant for and what has been done in that direction. If, after getting and studying the estimates, two Members or so from each party of this House will go to Mettur and satisfy themselves and make any recommendations as a result of their inspection, that will be very useful to the Government. We have not the slightest desire to keep anything back from the House or to delay the scrutiny of any matter. It is for that reason, although we have not got the revised estimates completely either for expenditure or for revenue, we put into this budget the available information as to the changes that are probable. Finally, during this debate occasional references were made to my distinguished predecessor Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar, and I think I ought to say—this is my first opportunity to speak about it—that at the completion of ten years or even a shorter time, it is my conviction that everybody will realize with gratitude, the ability, the energy and the stout optimism of Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar to which this project largely owes its inception and progress."

The motion was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided as follows:—

*Ayes.*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai.             | 26. Mr. C. Marudavanam Pillai.                  |
| 2. Mr. C. D. Appavu Chettiyar.                 | 26. " M. Narayana Rao.                          |
| 3. " R. Nagan Gowda.                           | 27. " A. Parasurama Rao Pantulu.                |
| 4. " T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.               | 28. " C. Ramasomayajulu.                        |
| 5. " C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.             | 29. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.         |
| 6. " Ramanan Goerka.                           | 30. Mr. P. Baktaivatsulu Nayudu.                |
| 7. " W. P. A. Soundara Pandia Nadar.           | 31. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo.              |
| 8. " Chavadi K. Subrahmanyam Pillai.           | 32. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao.                       |
| 9. " S. V. Vanavudaiya Gounder.                | 33. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.                    |
| 10. " U. Ramaswami Ayyar.                      | 34. " K. Koti Reddi.                            |
| 11. Syed Tajudin Sahib Bahadur.                | 35. " L. K. Tulasiram.                          |
| 12. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. | 36. " K. R. Karant.                             |
| 13. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.             | 37. " K. Madhavan Nayar.                        |
| 14. " S. Satyamurti.                           | 38. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabapathi Mudaliyar. |
| 15. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.            | 39. The Raja of Panagal.                        |
| 16. " P. Anjaneyulu.                           | 40. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.                |
| 17. " J. A. Saldanha.                          | 41. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.            |
| 18. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.             | 42. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu.      |
| 19. " G. Harisarvottama Rao.                   | 43. Rao Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar.           |
| 20. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar.              | 44. Muhammad Khadir Mohideen Sahib Bahadur.     |
| 21. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur.            | 45. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddy.         |
| 22. Mr. K. V. R. Swami.                        | 46. T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.                 |
| 23. " D. Narayana Raju.                        |   |
| 24. " B. S. Mallayya.                          |   |

*Noes.*

- |  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks.                   | 8. Mr. G. T. Boag.           |
| 2. The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 9. " A. McG. C. Tamboo.      |
| 3. The hon. Mr. T. E. Moir.                            | 10. " S. H. Slater.          |
| 4. " A. Y. G. Campbell.                                | 11. " C. B. Cotterell.       |
| 5. Rao Bahadur C. V. Anantakrishna Ayyar.              | 12. Mr. R. Foulkes.          |
| 6. Mr. F. B. Evans.                                    | 13. The Zamindar of Seithur. |
| 7. " H. A. Watson.                                     | 14. Mr. N. Siva Raj.         |
|  | 15. " M. V. Gangadara Siva.  |

17th March 1928]

*Noes.*

16. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami.  
 17. Mr. K. Krishnan.  
 18. " Kenneth Kay.  
 19. " W. O. Wright.  
 20. " C. R. T. Congreve.

21. Mr. A. T. Luker.  
 22. " S. Arpudaswami Udayar.  
 23. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.  
 24. Mr. R. Srinivasan.

*Neutral.*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 6. Mr. V. Ch. John.                      |
| 2. " S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.              | 7. " J. Kuppuswami.                      |
| 3. Dr. P. Subbarayan.                   | 8. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. |
| 4. Mr. P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai.         | 9. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai.           |
| 5. " J. Bheemayya.                      | 10. " D. Thomas.                         |

*Ayes* 46. *Noes* 24. *Neutral* 10. The motion was carried.

(At the time the poll was being taken, Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar stood up in favour of the motion when Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar loudly expressed his surprise by voicing the name of the Member.)

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I do not think it will be in order at the time the vote is taken for any hon. Member to make any observations. I request the hon. Members to keep silence when the voting is carried on.”

The demand (*minus* No. 100) was then put and carried and the grant made.

The Council adjourned for lunch.

**After lunch (2-30 p.m.).**

## DEMAND VIII—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—HEADS OF PROVINCES.

\* The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—“Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor I beg to move

‘for a grant not exceeding 6·32 lakhs under General Administration—Heads of Provinces.’”

\* Mr. S. ARPUADSWAMI UDAYAR :—“Mr. President, Sir, I move ‘for the reduction of the allotment of Rs. 19,200 for Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor by Rs. 100’ (to discuss the grant of Provincial autonomy with adequate safeguards for the rights of minority communities).

“Sir, this subject has often been discussed on the floor of this House. If nevertheless I press it upon the consideration of the Members of this Council it is because, standing as we do on the threshold of impending political changes, it is better for this Council to avail itself of the lessons which seven years experience of the present working of the constitution have forced upon them. Sir, responsibility to the electorate is a fundamental principle which governs all democratic institutions. The Ministers are expected to look to the Members of the Council for support and the Members of the Council are naturally expected to carry out the pledges and promises to which they stood committed when they sought popular franchise.”

[17th March 1928]

**Mr. S. SATYAMURTI** :—“ Oh, Command it to the new Ministers.”

\* **Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR** :—“ The Ministers should derive their support from the strongest party in the Council and should also derive much support and much inspiration with regard to suggestions relating to policies and ameliorative programmes from the majority of the Council. Therefore the natural course for the smooth and successful working of a democratic constitution is this kind of relationship existing between the Ministers and the Council and the Council and the electorate outside. Should however this order be reversed and the Ministers look to the Government party in the Council, which forms indeed a part of the Council but is not a popular machinery and was purposely devised to act as a check and a clog to regulate and slacken the pace of popular machinery, in that case the forms of democracy may survive, but its spirit have fled and it will tend to become an oligarchy. It is not necessary for me, at this distance of time, to refer to the causes and circumstances which led to the famous Montagu-Chelmsford report introducing this kind of dual administration. Sir, at a time when self-governing institutions had to be introduced and started on the way to the realization of self-government by progressive stages, I can understand the difficulty experienced by the framers of the constitution, the difficulties they had to meet with. To meet all kinds of objections, it was found by the authors of the Reforms that the only possible course for them was to effect a compromise and a compromise always means the imposition of certain checks and certain restraints. It implies a cautious policy and an attempt to afford more time for those who are expected to handle this machinery to acquire experience, skill and ease in its use by practical and successful manipulation. Further, the first stage was certainly an experimental stage. Now after seven years’ working of this machinery it is left for us to see whether this machinery has done the work which was expected of it, has fulfilled our expectations and whether it is not possible for us to proceed a step further and democratise the constitution. Sir, in this province this diarchy was alleged to have been successfully worked but even those who were mainly responsible for this successful working had to admit its failure. The report of the leader of the strongest party which worked this constitution successfully is published in the Muddiman Committee Report and on the floor of this House the Raja of Panagal said that this instrument was too delicate and too difficult to be successfully handled. You know, Sir, that I am the last person to introduce irrelevant details or drag in personalities. I will only say that speculatively considered and granting that there are two factors in the Council, one representing the popular electorate and the other acting as a kind of check, there is every possibility and probability of this element becoming the dominant element and exerting a potent influence on the policies and programmes of the popular representatives. Where Ministers are really turned out of their office not for their failure to carry out the mandate of the Council, nor for forfeiting the confidence of the House, but for other reasons, where Ministers look up to parties, whose programmes and policies are opposed to those for which their party stands, there will be always room for political opinions and creeds undergoing changes with meteoric rapidity and kaleidoscopic variety (hear, hear). Sir, I remember the time when from the north of India down to the south there was one cry that diarchy was on its trial. That was when the Swarajist party defeated the party then in power and when some time after, this party fallen from power passed a self-denying

17th March 1928] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar]

ordinance refusing to accept office until provincial autonomy was granted. Expectations were high in many quarters that the Swarajist party with this addition would surely end this form of government. I quite well remember also the words of certain journalists and politicians that those who were going to wreck the constitution were not the Swarajists but the followers of Abdur Rahim in Bengal and the followers of the Raja of Panagal in this Presidency. But, since that time much water had flowed under the bridges of the Cooum and under the bridges of so many other rivers in other districts and I don't think that any striking change has been brought about. I think that it is quite possible for a party or for Ministers who are naturally expected to represent the wishes of the electorate to continue to function provided they have the strong support of the dominant element in this Council. Sir, I have not dragged into the question personalities, but I merely spoke of the probabilities and possibilities of the present working of party Government. In my opinion, the remedy for all this is provincial autonomy. (Mr. Abdul Hamid Khan:—‘What is provincial autonomy?’) This fixes the responsibility on the Ministers, the Ministers having to administer almost all the departments will have to enlighten the public, to carry the public with them, to chalk out their programme, to make the public realize how far it is possible to carry out this programme and in all matters look to the majority party in the Council and to the electorate outside the Council for success or failure in carrying out these programmes. Again, Sir, seven years have passed and we are on the eve of great political changes and surely the public men in this country and Members of the Council who have held distinguished posts have administered transferred departments as Ministers, have acquired sufficient political experience and know responsible government is to be worked in order to promote the greatest good of the largest number. We have also had the experiment tried of entrusting important portfolios to Indian Members of the Reserved half and we know how they have risen equal to the occasion and how they have successfully discharged the responsibilities which were put upon them. With these years of political experience, I think, in this province men will be found who can work all the various departments very successfully and I believe the recommendation will be made to grant provincial autonomy.

“Sir, I represent a minority community. The only question is what will be the position of the minority communities under these changed conditions. It is quite possible for certain conventions to be formed as I know such conventions have been formed in the Dominion of Canada. I know, Sir, that in Canada there is a large Catholic population and also a large Protestant population. Conventions have been formed as a result of which we find a just and adequate representation of the members of both communities both in the services and in the Councils. These distinct denominations have their just claims and aspirations fully met. We find also conventions regulating the appointment of various special officers. Therefore, if in a country like Canada, healthy conventions could be formed and the popular machinery smoothly worked, with a concession here and a concession there, there being an understanding that as regards representation there ought to be a certain number, and this machinery has been working without causing the slightest hitch, affording satisfaction to all, I think in this province also, it is quite possible for us to have healthy conventions and also to lay down important safeguards for protecting the rights of minorities to have statutory provisions and safeguards.

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar]

[17th March 1928]

"I know, Sir, I am not blind to the fact, that in the matter of appointments or in the matter of nominations to local bodies, minorities like the Indian Christians are nowhere. But, when their vote is sought for and when by the remodelling of the franchise, certain large numbers of them are expected to be enrolled in the electoral bodies and when Members realize that responsibility means that they should also consult the welfare of all sections of the people, of minority communities, especially, who must be specially encouraged and helped to take their just and adequate share in the administration of the province, with all these safeguards laid down statutorily and also springing up as a result of healthy conventions, I think this full responsible government introduced into this province will be the best solution of these evils. There will be no longer anything tending towards oligarchy. It will be as far as possible a pure democracy, resting upon the suffrage of the electorate and making its will assertive and its views prevail with the Ministers and the Members of the Council."

MR. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—"Mr. President, Sir, this motion has been tabled and moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar, representing the Christian community with the object, I dare say, of taking the vote of this House on the question of further reforms that we in this country have been fighting for. But, I believe, the hon. Member has pitched his desire in the lowest key, and I think it was his intention to secure the vote of such of his colleagues as are prepared only for the minimum advance for the country that he thinks possible. Sir, this motion combines in itself two principles. One of them is with regard to the political advance of the country and the province as a whole and the second principle that he wishes to introduce in his motion is with regard to his anxiety to see that the minority communities and interests are safeguarded under the system of government that he wishes to usher into this province by this motion. With regard to the main question of provincial autonomy, I might say this : that it is a thing which has been talked of rather thoughtlessly and I know that the interpretation that has been put upon this phrase 'provincial autonomy' has been different with different groups of people and with different classes. The hon. Member, Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar, may have one idea of provincial autonomy and the hon. Mr. Moir may have another view of it. Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar may think that with provincial autonomy it may be a system of government which will be entirely in the hands of the people of this province and that the Cabinet consisting of all Ministers, will be entirely responsible to this House, the Legislative Council. But to another person who does not think like him, provincial autonomy may rightly mean a system of government which may have all non-Indians as Ministers and yet they may not be altogether responsible to the House. Even that, in the opinion of some, may be regarded as provincial autonomy. These are things which may be interpreted according to the times and according to the people. Provincial autonomy will not satisfy the requirements of the people of this province and much less the people of this country, because as it is well known that provincial autonomy will not be anything better than this diarchic system of government because even there you will have these safeguards which are regarded as safeguards for the maintenance of law and order, for the maintenance of good government, for the maintenance of the interests of the depressed classes, which certainly are worth being safeguarded. These are considerations which weigh with us on this side for not accepting this vague phrase, provincial autonomy, as our next political step.

17th March 1928] [Mr. Abdul Hamid Khan]

" Mr. President, Sir, as the House is aware, we the Congressmen will not be satisfied until we have full responsible government for the whole country.

" With regard to the next point, Sir, that this question has raised, namely, the safeguarding of the interests of minorities, under that system of government of provincial autonomy—Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar's intentions are indeed very good, but he wishes to lay down that the minority communities that inhabit this land particularly this province such as the Muslims and the Christians and other minority communities get equal justice. I am sure he does not insist on retaining the pernicious system of nominations, which has been doing such terrible mischief to all these communities, for which these nominations have been sought for. He has, I dare say, when he moved this motion stated very clearly that he is not for retaining nominations. Unless and until these minority communities who wish to have their interests safeguarded so far as the legislatures and local bodies are concerned make up their minds as to whether they are going to have their representatives in these bodies through election or through nominations as we have been having hitherto, those communities cannot hope to advance. No minority community will really progress as long as it wishes to have this pernicious system of nomination, by which the whole community is sought to be politically demoralized.

" Then, Sir, so far as the services are concerned, Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar would like to see that some safeguards are also provided for preserving the interests of the minority communities. On this question there have been two opinions. The first is, so far as the services are concerned, the aim should always be efficiency and then only communal representation. The other opinion has been that efficiency apart all the communities that inhabit this province should have equal and equitable representation in the services. These are the two opinions that have been expressed so far as I know. They seem to be apparently contradictory, but in my opinion there does not seem to be much difference, if only one would see to it that without affecting efficiency no injustice is done to any community or communities that inhabit this province.

" Sir, there are several minority communities which have been neglected under the present Government. What has been done is to put up minority communities to defend the interests of the Government. Very little has been done by way of advancing the interests of these minority communities either by the bureaucratic system of government or by the system of government that has come into existence during the last six or seven years.

" Particularly, the Muslim community has not received that amount of <sup>3 p.m.</sup> attention that it should have received. For instance, Sir, even in the matter of representation in local bodies they have been grossly neglected. Ministers came and Ministers went, but there is very little to show that the Mussalmans got their due share of representation on these local bodies, and nothing has been done either by the Muslim councillors that were here before us or even by the Ministers to see that sufficient representation by election was given to the Mussalmans in the various local bodies in this province.

" With regard to the services also, nothing has been done to see that equal justice was done to the Muslim community. This motion seeks to safeguard their interests when we, according to the mover, have provincial autonomy installed in our province. This question, I may tell the House, Mr. President,

[Mr. Abdul Hamid Khan] [17th March 1928]

cannot be settled by our moving a resolution of this kind in this House ; but this question will have to be settled among the various communities meeting at a conference outside this House and settling these things amicably, so that there may not be a third person in our midst to say that we do not come to an understanding. Therefore, it seems to me that it will not serve any useful purpose if we hand over this most important task to a third party to settle what should be the representation of the minority communities, either the Mussalmans or the Christians or the depressed classes, whether in the matter of representation in the local bodies or representation in the services. This is a question which affects the very future of this country. Therefore, as has been done with regard to the whole country by an All-Parties Conference which has been sitting from day to day, I believe that any result in this direction that will be useful to the country can be achieved only by having a conference of all the communities that inhabit this province sitting together and coming to some understanding ; by that alone, I think we can settle this question.”

\* Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I should like to offer a few remarks on this subject of the grant of provincial autonomy to our province. Sir, ever since we discussed last year in this House the grant of further reforms, may I ask whether the country has advanced further as regards the betterment of the depressed classes ? Personally speaking, I think provincial autonomy is really a good thing ; but from the point of view of the depressed classes, I do not think the time has yet come when we can ask for it. Sir, when discussing the question of the grant of further reforms last year in this House, Dr. Muthulakshmi Reddi clearly stated ‘Live and let others live.’ But going round the districts, I do not see even an atom of change in the mentality of our caste brethren. Sir, in the National Congress, a very important body, when it met in this great city in December last, its President, Dr. Ansari, pleaded for the amelioration of the depressed classes ; but, Sir, I fail to see whether a resolution in regard to the advancement of the depressed classes was recorded in the minutes of the proceedings of this great assembly.

“ Sir, coming now to the question of illiteracy which exists among the masses, are we justified in asking for any advancement in the political field ? Taking the census of 1921, I find among the depressed classes the male literates were only  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent while the women literates were .67 per cent. (Mr. P. Bhaktavatsalu Nayudu : ‘Who is responsible ?’) Of course, unless we are given political power in the Government, we are certainly at a loss to ask for further reforms. My hon. Friend, Mr. Hamid Khan, was telling us something about the evils of nomination. But, Sir, had it not been for the courtesy extended by the Government, looking to the danger of the depressed classes who are in a minority, being left unrepresented, of nominating a few of them to represent their cause and to express their grievances in this House for redress, we would have been in a very bad plight. The other day, Sir, in Tiruppur taluk, when a member of our community sought election to the panchayat court, he was able to get through ; but what happened next was that the huts of the depressed classes in that place were burnt. Sir, under these circumstances, can we ask for further reforms unless the mentality of our people in the various districts is changed ? During the last year’s debate, my hon. Friend, Mr. Thomas, of Tinnevelly enquired whether we should all wait until the minority communities came to our level and then ask for more reforms.

17th March 1928] [Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai]

A few days ago when he was talking about the representation of the depressed classes in the various services, he clearly stated that, unless 50 per cent of the depressed classes were admitted into the various departments, there would be no satisfaction to the depressed classes. Sir, there are various things which stand to-day as stumbling blocks in our joining those people who ask for more reforms at present. So I am saying that the time has not yet come when we can ask for provincial autonomy. Even if provincial autonomy is granted, unless we find a member of the depressed classes in the Treasury benches or among the Ministers to safeguard our interests, I do not think it will be a step in the right direction."

\* Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR :—“ Mr President, Sir, the question now raised by my hon. Friend of the depressed classes is a very difficult and delicate one on which it is well that this House should come to some clear understanding. The experience of the last few years since the Reforms were granted must have clearly left an indelible impression upon the minds of every one of us that the whole system as has been devised is highly unsatisfactory. Either the House should be responsible to the people of the country at large or it should have no responsibility at all. We would rather have no diarchy and revert back to the original state of things than have this anomalous position. Sir, we do not know what our leaders will do in the next moment. Sometimes they plunge us into unknown depths where even angels would fear to tread. And here we are to-day in a very pitiable predicament where our leaders are, like marionettes, dancing to the tune of different sets of people working behind, and not even having the courage to come forward. Here we have got leaders who will not safeguard our interests but who will simply say that they are Ministers ; but they are not Ministers at all. They are not the Ministers chosen by the people. I make bold to say that the present state of affairs, especially during the last few days, have proved so ludicrous that we are inclined to think that, whether we are to get a further amount of Reforms or not, it is better to go back than have the present state of things. Going deep down to the very hearts of the people, we find that there is a burning indignation and a dreary feeling in the minds of our people. Are there not people in this House who burn with the feeling that we should liberate ourselves from these letters ? Do not they feel that the political life of the people is something degrading, demoralizing ? We are here to reconstruct a beautiful State, a good State which will be an example to the rest of the world and not to seek plums of office of this kind or that kind or to be satisfied with promises which are given to us now and then for all sorts of things. I would now request, Sir, that we should consider and very carefully consider two points. The first point I would suggest for your consideration is that if provincial autonomy is to be had it should be had at once. We cannot afford to wait for even one minute. We are not at all satisfied with the present state of affairs which clearly shows that this diarchy should be abolished. We are not going to put up with the present state of affairs any longer. My hon. Friend, Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar, has raised the question of provincial autonomy. I say we must go on some principle. There must be something definite on which we should go. The most important point is that we must be entirely responsible in the making of Ministries. That is the point which I want to emphasize very strongly. We cannot have these Ministers any further. These Ministers should be in a position to carry out the will of the people, and they must not be people who

[Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar] [17th March 1928]

will say that they are not responsible. They must be prepared to say ‘These are the changes that we are going to bring about’ and they must have the power to carry out what they consider is best for the people. If they are not able to do that, it is better that we do not have them at all as Ministers.

3-15 p.m. “Sir, all of us say that we want provincial autonomy and at the same time some of us declare that their interests should be protected adequately. In this no one is more vehement than the depressed classes. I ask my friends belonging to the depressed classes to join us as only then we make an impression that we are all united.”

\* Mr. K. KRISHNAN :—“Sir, I do not quite understand how this question of discussing the propriety of granting of provincial autonomy with adequate safeguards for the rights of minority communities comes within this grant of Rs. 19,200 to the Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor. The grant of provincial autonomy is a broad question and I do not see. . . .”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“Is it a point of order that is being raised?”  
(Laughter.)

\* Mr. K. KRISHNAN :—“No, Sir, I am only saying that I do not see the propriety of discussing this subject in connexion with the grant to the Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor. As far as the question of provincial autonomy is concerned I am in favour of it provided sufficient safeguards are provided for protecting the interests of the minority communities. That is a question of wider issue and we have to consider various aspects of the question before we can say one way or the other. No doubt reforms in proper directions will be welcomed by any Member of this House. (Hear, hear.) But as has been pointed out in this motion the question of the protection of the minority communities has seriously to be taken into consideration. If provincial autonomy is to be granted the question of nomination goes. As a nominated Member of this House, I am not pleading for the castes which I represent, but I say in general that sufficient safeguards should be made, and it is a question that will baffle statesmen. But I do not know whether this question will be solved if we are prepared to grant special representation to the various communities. Then another question will arise —how many allied communities may be put together and whether a particular community will fall under a particular category. I do not on that account say that reforms are unnecessary. What I do say is that these are various aspects of the question which have to be considered. I am not to be put down as one who is reactionary when I say that certain interests have to be taken into consideration. Yesterday we saw a great deal of crocodile tears being shed over the fate of the depressed classes when the question of excise was taken up. It was said that great temptations have been put in their way. But those hon. Members did not realize how much of unemployment will be created by the abolition of that department, to which so many persons owe their bread. (Cries of Oh!) I do not say that I am against prohibition. But I do say that before we abolish that department we should provide work to those officers.”

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“Order, order, the hon. Member will not be justified in introducing his views on prohibition.”

\* Mr. K. KRISHNAN :—“I am only saying that representation of these communities is not adequate.”

17th March 1928]

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ What are you here for ? ” (Laughter.)

\* Mr. K. KRISHNAN :—“ I want more men (Laughter), whether it is by election or nomination so that the interest of my community and others may be safeguarded. If all these interests are provided for and if the conditions are such that the grant of provincial autonomy will be for the advancement of the people of the country I am not against it. (Laughter.) I hope when the framers of the future constitution put together all the vested interests of the innumerable minority communities they will find their difficulty. Under such circumstances although I do not subscribe to this motion I am in favour of provincial autonomy if all the safeguards are provided for and if it will not interfere with the smooth administration of the country.” (A voice : ‘ Thank you.’)

Mr. S. Venkiah then spoke in Telugu.

After Mr. S. Venkiah had finished his speech, Sri<sup>man</sup> BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo rose up and said :—“ Mr. President, I request you to translate the speech of the hon. Member in English.”

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ It only means delay. Suppose a Member speaks in Tamil then it has to be translated. It is allowed in the Central Provinces. I have no objection if any special arrangement is made. If we are to allow translation then as Mr. S. Venkiah does not know English all the speeches will have to be translated into Telugu. (Laughter.) It will be better if we translate every speech in all the four languages.” (Laughter.)

Sri<sup>man</sup> BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—“ Madras with four different languages calls for a special and preferential treatment in this.”

\* Rao Sahib R. SRINIVASAN :—“ Mr. President, Sir, we members of the depressed classes and especially their representatives here have been dragged from here to there to join one party or other. A strong agitation is being got up for the abolition of nomination. We say we want universal suffrage and larger representation in a modified form. But I fear the mass of the people in the village do not know even the rudiment of these things. And this is more so in the case of the Adi-Dravidas.

“ Now taking a friendly attitude I shall put before you an instance.

“ The Government that was 50 years ago is not the same Government now. There are more Indian elements even in higher service than there were before. Young men of the depressed classes who have passed their school final and entered service in mufassals suffer intolerably at the hands of the caste Hindu officers. A young Adi-Dravida who was in the Chittoor Collectorate has been transferred to the Labour Commissioner’s office. The depressed classes men who were competent to enter service had to enlist themselves as caste Hindus or Christians. The service is filled with caste Hindus.

“ Take the case of the karnams and village headmen in the ryotwari and zamindari villages. They are many in number. But the number of such officers belonging to the depressed classes can be counted on one’s fingers’ ends. I don’t think there will be more than a few of them. The power of the karnam and the village headman is great not only in the villages of which they are the monarchs but also in the Revenue Board and even in the office of the Secretary of State for India, Sir. A Collector can more easily dismiss or suspend his head clerk, sarishtadar, whereas in the case of a village karnam

[Mr. R. Srinivasan]

[17th March 1928]

he has to think half a dozen times. If provincial autonomy is granted, who will govern? The whole government will be in the hands of these people who belong to the upper castes. Most of the hon. the elected Members of this House are under the thumbs of the village munisif. Did we not see so much support given in this House to the increase of salary and to increase the numbers of these village officers? They are a very powerful people. They will rule the country.

"Again, Sir, take the Police department. Out of 20,000 policemen, I believe not more than 200 members are of the depressed classes, in the whole corps. If in the circumstances provincial autonomy is granted our fate is doomed and the caste system will be strengthened. Hon. Members who know the condition in the villages will bear me out of what I said. It is all easy to talk of provincial autonomy and to say that we should have our own government. But look at the poor people, look at the ryot. Would it be a government of the people, Sir? We, the depressed classes, are the sons of the soil and we have a right as everybody else; we want our country to be ruled by ourselves (Hear, hear) but then we are not fit. (Cries of 'Oh!' and 'we are fit.') Our policy is to pull down the caste Hindus from the political ladder, till they raise us, the depressed classes, in the social ladder."

\* Mr. D. THOMAS :—"Mr. President, Sir, I have been listening carefully to the speeches of the members representing the depressed classes."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—"They do not represent the depressed classes."

A voice :—"They misrepresent the depressed classes."

\* Mr. D. THOMAS :—"They have spoken on behalf of the depressed classes. I do not yield to any hon. Member in this House in sympathizing with the just claims and rights of the depressed classes. But I am sorry that the real issue is sought to be confounded by irrelevant matters. The question of provincial autonomy is one of national import; and it ought not be decided from the view point of a particular community or communities. I belong to a minority community and whether my community enjoys its just claims and rights or not, I for one will not stand in the way of the country's just claims and rights to provincial autonomy being secured. Far better will I take the chance of our just rights and claims being lost sight of or ignored in an autonomous provincial government rather than continue under the present diarchic system of administration. Admittedly the present system is a transitional expedient and we must either move forward or go back to the old state of things. I hope that even my hon. Friends who spoke on behalf of the depressed classes would not favour a retrograde step. The only other alternative is to go forward and the minimum demand in the present state of things is provincial autonomy. The position of the depressed classes in a provincially autonomous constitution will be more favourable to the enjoyment of their just rights than now. My hon. Friend, Mr. Muniswami Pillai, referred to my suggestion the other day that for the social upliftment of the depressed classes 50 per cent of the recruitment for constables should be from the depressed classes. But under the present constitution all our resolutions on the subject are mere recommendations to the hon. Member in charge of Police and they have no binding effect on him, as it would be if he were a minister amenable to the vote of the House under a provincially autonomous constitution. Therefore under a provincially autonomous constitution there will be

17th March 1928]

[Mr. D. Thomas]

greater opportunities for the depressed classes to more effectively and rapidly obtain their rights than under this system of Government. My hon. Friend complained against the other sections of the House, because at the present moment these members representing other communities are not providing their just rights. But we members belonging to the other communities are not able to have an effective voice in getting these just rights under this constitution. Is not a change in the constitution desirable so that all the communities may have their just rights secured? What better way, what more effective way of achieving this right could be found than by provincial autonomy. In a provincial autonomous constitution where there will be no reserved half in the Government not amenable to the vote of the House, the depressed classes will have effective representation and will have all their grievances heard and considered by the Government effectively, and their just rights and claims will be established. I hope that very shortly we shall have an autonomous provincial constitution and my hon. Friends will have the just rights and claims of their communities established."

\* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—“ Mr. President, Sir, it has fallen to me to answer this motion. It seems to me rather hard at first sight that some unfortunate clerk in the Private Secretary’s office should be deprived of his pay because the House is in favour of provincial autonomy. As I said on a similar occasion last year, this is a Provincial Government, a subordinate Government and we did not make the constitution and we have no power to alter it.

“ We cannot make recommendations unless we are invited to do so. I would only say that when the time comes to make our recommendations we will consider carefully the speeches we have made to-day which are most interesting.” 3-45 p.m.

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Sir, George Meredith defined cynicism as intellectual dandyism without the cox-comb’s feathers. I think that description suits my hon. Friend, the Revenue Member, excellently well. He has no cox-comb’s feathers; he is a cynic. I have heard him here often. Nothing seems to me to affect him; he is not affected by anything which goes on here and the last few days he has been regaling me across the table with remarks which show cynicism such as I have not seen anywhere else. Therefore he is a cynic; his cynical answer is ‘ I have no views on the matter; you have made excellent speeches; I have not been invited to make any recommendations; I have no views on the subject. . . . ’ ”

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—“ I did not say that I had no views on the subject.”

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Sir, it means that his cynicism is more profound than otherwise. He has his own views; he will not give us the benefit of his views; he will have it for his own benefit. He is so cynical of the House and the debates therein that he will not waste his breath in giving two minutes to give expression to his views in this Council. He says ‘ the speeches made are very interesting; I will report them to the proper authorities; I am content; I will sit down.’ I will ask him one question which I hope he will answer but which I think he will not answer. What is the evidence he is going to put before the Simon Commission? Because, I find they are going to co-operate with the Commission in spite of us. What is the case they are going to place? Are they going to say that provincial autonomy should be given? Are they going to take back the reforms or .

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[17th March 1928]

perpetuate the present state of things? (A voice: 'Confidential'.) Of course they are confidential.

"Coming to the merits of the motion, my hon. Friend, the Mover of the motion, need not have laboured the point because, if my memory serves me right, this matter is *res judicata* so far as this House is concerned. This House has raised this question and decided that provincial autonomy is the next step that ought to be given. But I was very glad to hear my hon. Friend the Mover's speech. He has discovered and he has told this wondering House and the still more wondering outside world, that Ministers must be responsible to the Council and that the Council must be responsible to the electorates. I am glad that that discovery has been made by him though somewhat late. But I hope the discovery will not fleet away, but would stay with him in this and future Councils of which he may happen to be a Member. I was very glad to hear his references to election pledges. Due to recent events I think some hon. Members including the recent occupants of the Treasury Bench need to be reminded of the solemnity of the election pledges. I am, therefore, glad that my hon. Friend mentioned that election pledges were meant to be kept up and not to be broken in spite of the temptation of ministerial offices. I am glad also, Sir, that he has now seen under diarchy we have all the forms of democracy without the real spirit of democracy. I congratulate him again on that discovery though somewhat late. I hope again that the discovery will remain with him. With his accustomed Christian charity to see the other man's point of view always he has laid down that diarchy was a compromise and therefore was unsatisfactory. He has also given a certificate to himself and to his late colleagues that diarchy has worked successfully in this Province. But there have been difficulties which have been admitted. He has even gone to the extent of saying that he doubts if even the small element of real responsibility exists after the recent happenings in this House. Sir, I do not propose to go into that now; I shall reserve it for a later and more appropriate stage. But meantime this afternoon I merely want to say that the events of the last few days have destroyed two contributions of the Justice party to the public and political life of this Province. The Justice party had, in their days, achieved two items of political progress, first, the principle of joint responsibility among Ministers and secondly the principle of leaders of political parties being summoned to take up ministerial offices. The events of the last few days have destroyed both those principles. What is the part several parties of this House have taken in that undertaking I do not say this afternoon but this I do say that the achievements of the Justice party from the political point of view are very great, firstly the appointment of political leaders as Ministers and secondly that Ministers must stand or fall together. Both those principles have been destroyed within the last few days. It remains to be seen whether the Justice party is going to disclaim its own children as the time comes later on as it must.

"Then, Sir, my hon. Friend also said that Ministers must have the support of a dominant party in the Council. I am glad again to hear that discovery though somewhat late. But I am particularly anxious that that thing should be tested as early as possible. Then my hon. Friend said, 'We want provincial autonomy.' But as we are somewhat doubtful about the meaning of this phrase, I will be delighted, and we should like to know from my hon. Friend whether he means full responsible government without any reservation whatever. That commentary seems to be all the more necessary after the strange

17th March 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

unheard-of dictum laid down by the hon. the Minister for Education, Local Self-Government and Religious Endowments since the other day, viz., that total prohibition is not only a reserved subject but a reserved Central subject. When we have got such constitutional dicta on the Treasury Bench, I think it becomes all the more necessary to know exactly what is meant by the phrase 'provincial autonomy.' Unless, therefore, that phrase is defined a vote on provincial autonomy may mean anything or nothing. It may mean that even the small control which the Secretary of State and the Government of India now exercise over the irresponsible half may be abolished and it becomes decreased not only against us but against the superior powers. Therefore that phrase does not take us very far.

" Then his cut also refers to the question of minorities. I want to deal with this question of minorities without any desire to harm anybody's susceptibilities; for I feel that this is a matter on which the representatives of those minority communities feel very keenly and very justly so. I do not want to say anything which may wound the feelings of the one side or of the other. But, Sir, I do ask very respectfully to-day without casting any reflections upon the present Members of the Legislative Council who have come in by the door of nomination—they are doing their best against tremendous odds—whether their hands will not be considerably strengthened by their feeling that they have an electorate behind them, on which they can fall, to which they can appeal and whose support they can get for the measures of social and political reforms which they want to promote in this country or elsewhere. After all, Mr. President, they are here for the purpose of representing the interests of the various depressed classes. Under the Legislative Council Rules, 10 persons ought to be appointed to represent the following communities, so on and so forth. They are here to represent those communities and the Governor may, in his discretion, make regulations providing for their election by the communities concerned. Therefore, the Government of India and the Secretary of State contemplate even under the existing regime rules being framed to provide for the election of these representatives by the communities concerned. It seems to me that it will be much better from their point of view if they are elected and are present in this House as elected Members. But the hon. Mover has raised the larger question of adequate safeguards for minorities under any scheme of provincial autonomy or of Swaraj. I am at one with him in that matter. In this country inhabited unfortunately by different religions and different communities you are never going to have harmonious and efficient working of Swaraj or Self-Government unless all communities learn to trust one another and have confidence in one another. I agree with him. (Mr. N. Siva Raj shakes his head in dissent.) But my hon. Friend need not be cynical. Cynicism is cheeky. But I do suggest to him to repose faith in humanity. He is an honoured, educated and cultured representative of a community which has received unjust treatment in the past. He does not serve his community by being cheeky. He ought to try, according to his own humble mite, to help that community to assert itself not only as against others, but to raise itself and play its rightful part in the full national life of this country. More particularly I ask him to-day not to use the condition of his unfortunate community for the perpetuation of foreign domination over us. I want cultured educated Members like the hon. Member who must be equal to all the elected Members and superior to some of them not to depend upon Mr. Slater to protect their interests but to depend upon themselves and their communities, to have more faith in

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[17th March 1928]

themselves and say ‘this is my country and I will rule it’. Who is there to prevent it?

“What do we ask for to-day? We ask for complete Swaraj with adult suffrage and you will have 26, 40 or 60 millions of votes.”

Mr. N. SIVA RAJ:—“We will act when the time comes and not talk.”

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—“People who say that they will act when the time comes will not act at all. I find he talks quite as often. He does not follow his own precept. I follow his example rather than his precept. He may give a lecture to us some time later. But meantime let me tell him that the time has come for sinking our differences. The time has never come to those who will act ‘when the time comes’. The time has come. It has come long ago. No doubt you have been here for 18 months. What have you done? I ploughing the sands? It seems to me that these unfortunate gentlemen who want to use their community for merely perpetuating foreign domination are not taking necessary steps to improve themselves, their communities and their country. Our proposition is this: We want Swaraj and adult suffrage. Twenty, 40 or 60 millions of the depressed classes will have their potent voice in the election of representatives to the Councils and to the Assembly.

“Then my hon. Friend Mr. Srinivasan said that the unfortunate Adi-Dravidas could not read, they could not vote and they had no opinions. I think and I know that they can express their opinions. The mere knowledge of the three R’s is not necessary to enable a man to find out exactly what is good for him or bad for him. If an Adi-Dravida can choose his lawyer, his doctor, etc., he can also choose his representative for the Legislative Council. I therefore suggest to my hon. Friends that they are casting unmerited slur on their own communities when they say they cannot vote. They can vote just as well as many others who are supposed to belong to the higher castes.

“On the larger question, apart from the so-called depressed classes, of Muslims, Christians and other minority communities my own personal opinion is that all communities will stand to gain by accepting the principle of joint electorates with reservation of seats for minorities on population basis. Speaking on behalf of the Indian National Congress, I may say at once that Congressmen realize that this solution need not be forced down the throats of any minority community whatever. We are going to suggest this principle to the minorities. If the minorities accept it, well and good. But if the minorities think that the time has not come, we will not force this principle down their throats. I may assure Christians, Mussalmans and all minority communities that their interests will be amply safeguarded and protected, consistent with the interests of the nation as a whole, under Swaraj and therefore they have nothing to fear from Swaraj.

4 p.m. “The Swaraj that we contemplate is not a Hindu Swaraj or a Muslim Swaraj or a Depressed Classes Swaraj, but an Indian Swaraj in whose affairs members of all the communities will have an equal voice.

“Sir, I would like to suggest to my Friend, the Mover of the resolution, that the mere passing of this resolution and asking for provincial autonomy will not cut any ice. Although we have passed so many resolutions, we will never be able to do anything unless we are able to develop the sanctions to

17th March 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

enforce these demands. I may also add that long before my hon. Friend thought of tabling this resolution, the three leaders of the Justice party wrote in their minute to the Muddiman Committee that nothing short of provincial autonomy will satisfy them.

“Sir, we are exactly where we were. I also agree with the hon. the Mover that this *Trisanku Swarga* must go. Even the pre-reform days were better. But, Sir, I have no time to develop this theory. As a matter of fact, to-day, under diarchy the bureaucracy is stronger than it was before the introduction of diarchy; for the reason that there is no possibility of two people governing one country; either Great Britain has got to rule us, or India has got to rule India. Sir, the bureaucracy is pretending to let Indians rule India, without giving the power in their hands. This can deceive nobody.

“My hon. Friend the nominated Member from Ootacamund complained that no resolution was passed at the Congress. Does he expect the Congress to pass a resolution on the subject at every session of the Congress? The President of the Congress has referred to it. And I may point out here that at Vaikom and recently at Tiruvannamalai the Congress took up the cause of the Adi-Dravidas and sent them men and money. I claim no credit for it, but these instances will show that we are interested in the welfare of the so-called depressed classes and are trying to help them to the extent to which our resources and opportunities permit. If we are unable to do more, it is because we are powerless. Sir, what happened to Lala Lajpat Rai’s resolution in the Assembly asking for a crore of rupees for the education of the depressed classes? The Government opposed the resolution. To my friends of the depressed classes who pin their faith in the bureaucracy, I say the sympathy of the bureaucracy will last only for eight months more till the Simon Commission leaves India. Government will give them promises, pledges and what not. They will shed tears for their sufferings. They will say: ‘We are your friends, not those rascals. We are angels.’ After eight months are over, will emerge the iron hand. This game they are playing and will continue to play. I would request my brethren of the depressed classes, in the name of Mother India, not to walk into their parlour.

“Then, Sir, my hon. Friend Mr. Muniswami Pillai referred to the social evils and said that they must be remedied before we can have provincial autonomy. This is arguing in a vicious circle. This reminds me of the story of the man who was told that he will not get married unless he got sane and he will not get sane unless he got married. In the end the man got neither married nor sane. (Laughter.) The depressed classes are going to have these social evils removed along with the achievement of Swaraj. These social evils are going to be removed by themselves. Sir, no community can depend upon another community; it must and will depend upon itself under Swaraj. Then my hon. Friend said we shall have seven ministers, and we shall have one from the depressed classes. I ask ‘Why are you so very modest? Why not have more ministers?’ Sir, the whole of the speeches of the representatives of the depressed classes seemed to smack of an inferiority complex.

“Then, Sir, my Friend Mr. Kotieth Krishnan told us that his sympathies were with Swaraj, although he would not vote for this cut. This brings to my mind the retort the late Mr. Gokhale gave to Mr. (now Sir) Maneckji Dadhabhai when he spoke on his Elementary Education Bill. Mr. Gokhale was making a strenuous campaign for his Bill and he made a speech on the

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[17th March 1928]

first reading of the Bill. Mr. Dadhabhai got up and professed sympathy with the Bill, but ended by opposing it. Mr. Gokhale then said ‘Your Excellency, I have some use for the sympathy of the Government with my Bill for I can occasionally translate it into rupees, annas and pies, but I have no use for the sympathy of the non-officials.’ The cause of Swaraj has no use for the sympathy of Mr. Kotieth Krishnan. He said that he was satisfied with the present mal-administration and did not want Swaraj. Sir, I have no use for such people.

“ My hon. Friend Mr. Srinivasan complained that they are being dragged hither and thither by all sorts of parties. I sympathize with him. The only way to remove them is to have your own party and electorate and to have a mandate behind you. You can have no principles or programmes or policy, so long as you give away your votes for the mere asking to my hon. Friends the Ministers. In the course of a day or two, the new Ministers will come to you and will say that they will do this; they will do that. They will promise all sorts of things, appointments to temple committees, local boards, etc. I would appeal to you: Do not listen to them. (The hon. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar: ‘I am not doing this.’) Then you are a fool, if you do not canvass support for yourself.”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ Sir, on a point of order. Has the hon. Member got any right to call another Member fool ? ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Did the hon. Member use the word ? ”

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Yes, Sir, I did, but in a Pickwickian sense.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The hon. Member must withdraw the word.”

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I do, Sir.”

Sir JAMES SIMPSON :—“ Apologise.”

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Sir James Simpson is not yet the President of this House.

“ Then, Sir, the question of the representation of the depressed classes and minorities in the services was also brought in. I submit, Sir, this is the proverbial red-herring. I recognize that minority communities have a just claim to be adequately represented in the public services of the country. I am one of those who believe with the Congress that the public services ought not to be the monopoly of any community. All communities should have, subject to minimum standards of efficiency, equal opportunities of serving the country. But, Sir, this is not going to be solved or gained by using it as an argument against Swaraj. On the other hand, it is going to be solved only under Swaraj.

“ The last argument of the members of the depressed classes was: We are for provincial autonomy. We want to rule this country ourselves, but we are not ready. Sir, even in the Joint Committee Report they point out that it is not possible for any person or nation to learn to govern except by making mistakes, and suffering the consequences. Even assuming for the sake of argument that we are unfit to govern ourselves, to my mind, the only way to learn to govern this country is to attempt it. Make the mistakes and then learn to rule this country effectively. For the matter of that, is any country fit to govern itself? Is England fit? (Cries of ‘ No ’.) According to England, is Russia fit? or Egypt? Sir, no country can be the judge of the capacity of any other country to govern itself. We must be the judges of our own fitness. We ought to be, and we are, quite fit.

17th March 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

"These are the arguments, Sir, which were advanced. So far as our position as the Congress Party in this Council is concerned our demand is for complete and full responsible government in British India and at once. That demand has been reaffirmed by the All Parties' Conference at its recent Session in Delhi and the representative of the Justice Party has subscribed to it. In fact, Sir, there is not one party that has not subscribed to it. Sir, my friend Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar whose presence I very much miss here represented the Justice Party at the Conference, and, as a member who took a prominent part in its deliberations, he is for the immediate attainment of full responsible government by India. We cannot therefore accept that policy and at the same time say that provincial autonomy is our goal.

"As regards the protection of minorities, I have stated our position quite clearly. We are prepared to make all reasonable concessions to minorities so that they may feel they have ample safeguards for justice and due representation, whether in the Government of the country or in the public services of the country.

"Sir, we are for the attainment of full and complete responsible Government by this country. That being the position, we have decided as a party to remain neutral on this motion, leaving it to the Independents and the Justice Party to do what they please. Sir, we have so decided, but we would invite all parties in this House to co-operate with us in asking for nothing less than Swaraj under which alone all communities can live and prosper happily."

\* Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—"Sir, with your permission I would like to say just a word or two. We have listened to a good deal of eloquence on the motion before this House. Sir, I may say at once that, with most of what has been said, myself and my party are in entire agreement. (Hear, hear). But I fail to see, Sir, how by reducing the salary of the Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor we are going to get any the nearer to the attainment of provincial autonomy or Swaraj. May also I ask, Sir, in all humility whether we are going any nearer to that goal by calling the Ministers there 'traitors' and 'fools'? Sir, we shall only be bringing discredit to ourselves by indulging in that kind of discreditable talk.

"Sir, I was listening rather very carefully to the hon. the Deputy Leader of the Swarajya Party. But, Sir, I was at a loss to know whether he was speaking in support of the motion or against it. At the end of the discourse, however, I found that as a party they are going to remain neutral. In this respect, I may say that we are going to copy their example. (Hear, hear); not certainly for the reasons that he has given but for the very simple reason that by passing this cut and reducing the salary of the Private Secretary we shall certainly not get nearer the goal of provincial autonomy than we are now. Long before all this display of eloquence by the Swarajists on this subject, provincial autonomy was put forward by our Ministers in their memorandum to the Muddiman Committee as their minimum demand. That is our irreducible minimum still. Then, the Deputy Leader of the Swarajya Party was all praise to the Justice Party and its Leaders. But I may say, Sir, that we are not in need of any praise from that quarter. (Mr. S. Satyamurti: where do you look to then for praise?) However, we are thankful for it. I know why all this praise was bestowed on us to-day. He himself did not make a secret of it. In a day or two he says that he is going to put to the test the principles which we have been advocating all this time.

[Mr. S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar]

[17th March 1928]

**4-15 p.m.** “ I am sure, Sir, we are quite prepared for that test, (Hear, hear) and will easily come out of it as unscathed as any respectable political party can. (Hear, hear). In what we do we would be justified by the principles we have accepted ; and by those principles we stand. I would only say this with regard to this question of the attainment of provincial autonomy. If only the hon. Members who sit above the gangway were more consistent in their demand than they have been in the past, perhaps we will be nearer to it than by passing a motion of this kind. Conditions do arise when even a very notable member of that party, who is inspired by the purest kind of nationalism, thinks that diarchy is not after all a barren tree. He made a pronouncement, Sir, not long ago that in diarchy after all he discovered a tree which was not barren. That was at a time not when these three hon. Ministers were sitting there but at a time when a different trio of Ministers were sitting. And we had revelations from members of that party, who have no doubt since rebelled against that party, as to what really the implication of the statement of the hon. the Deputy Leader was. So far as we are concerned the tree has been the same. If it was barren before, it is barren even now. If it was fertile before, it is fertile even now. A good deal was said, Sir, as to the vagueness of the expression, provincial autonomy. When the hon. Member, Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar was speaking on the motion I heard a member of the Swarajist Party saying, ‘ what is provincial autonomy ? ’ May I, Sir, with the same feeling of doubt, ask the hon. Members who spoke on this side of the House what ‘ complete independence ’ and ‘ full responsible Government ’ mean ? Well, Sir, after all these are phrases and I am sorry to have to say that, in the present state of our political development, unfortunately we very often become slaves to phrases. It is not unnatural that it should be so. All these apart, I say that we are as much in favour of provincial autonomy as the most nationalistic of our friends sitting up there. If, therefore, we remain neutral on this it is for the reason, Sir, that by reducing the salary of the Private Secretary by Rs. 100 or any amount we are not going to get provincial autonomy.”

\* Mr. N. SIVA RAJ :—“ I did not want to speak here this evening. But after hearing the eloquent speech of the hon. Member for the University, I want to say a few words on this question. He sought refuge under patriotism and started calling those of us, who honestly differed from his political views, cynics. I do not want to defend myself against that charge. But his argument is the argument of those who have been very rightly said to be extremists in politics and conservatives in social reforms. Now, in this country, Sir, people are trying their best to draw a distinction between political questions and social questions and they go further and say that the political advancement of the country does not depend upon the solution of the social problem. But I am one of those who believe—that, unless these social questions are really and practically solved, there is no bright future for our country. I am an Indian myself and should feel like an Indian (Hear, hear). If I should fight for the freedom of India I should feel like an Indian. (A voice : ‘ Do you feel ’). Do you believe that it is not possible for me to feel like an Indian at all having been born and lived in India ? If I do not feel like that I say, it is not my fault. (A voice : It is the fault of your agitation’.) In this country social boycott is resorted to as a method of forcing down one’s political opinion upon another. Do you think there is any hope of political freedom for this country ? We really and honestly feel, Sir, that unless this question is solved, India is not fit for a system of

17th March 1928]

[Mr. N. Siva Raj]

government under which we are all supposed to be free. People who have got wealth in their hands, who have caste, education and culture will always form a great source of burden to us. Perhaps in the interests of India I have to oppose the grant of provincial autonomy. Such an autonomy even if got, we may not be able to retain. For aught we know, taking the present circumstances and past sufferings we might fall a prey into the hands of the Bolsheviks as in Soviet Russia. Then India will be a country not worthy to live in. That is the aspect that suggests itself to me at the present moment. My friend concluded by saying that even the Justice Party are now claiming full provincial autonomy. Might I remind him that people who were once afraid of the 'flying column in advance' have now joined the 'flying column in advance' themselves. We feel we ought not to join with those people sitting beside him at the present moment. (A voice: 'Why don't you join it?') My hon. Friend suggested that we shall have separate electorates. On this question of electorate, though in theory any man may say that electorate will solve all difficulties and we might really represent the public opinion, in practice, it will prove the opposite. I will prove my statement and challenge any member to deny what I say—that an electorate is really no good to us at the present moment. Supposing you have an electorate what really happens in the outskirts of the district is this. We are people who are not educated, who are highly indebted and are under the grips of Mirasidars and landlords who can get all these depressed classes vote in any way they like. (A voice: 'So long as there are toddy shops there.') I am just coming to that. I was merely going to say that the representative will be just those who can always hang on to those caste people. (A voice: Why not men like you stand?) I am certain my hon. Friends know just as well as I do that at the present moment it is not possible in our country. (A voice: 'You are not in touch with your own people'). Hon. Members with knowledge of the conditions existing in the mafassal will agree with me in saying that at present the representative will really be a representative of the caste people. I dare say these people will just put up those candidates who are suitable to them and not suitable to us. (A voice: 'You put up') (Another voice: 'You want Government to put you up?') Not at all. I am not in the least suggesting. . . . (At this stage there were many interruptions which were inaudible in the reporter's gallery.) I do not catch my hon. Friends' interruptions."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I do not like that the speaker should be interrupted like this by long sentences. If members persist in this I will have to enforce rule 17 to my very great regret and maintain the discipline of the House."

\* Mr. N. SIVA RAJ:—"An impression is evidently going round that we the members of the depressed classes are working against the interests of India and the Indian nation. At least the responsibility is upon the hon. Members of this House who call themselves elected members to make us feel like Indians and act like Indians. When the time comes, Sir, as I told you and the hon. Member for the University when we feel and act like Indians it is not in this way we shall fight and not in this place. It will elsewhere and it will really be for India. India will never get her freedom unless and until we feel and act like Indians. I say that the real battle of Indian freedom will have to be fought and won by us in this country. (Voices: Doomsday? Doomsday?) "

[17th March 1928]

\* Sir JAMES SIMPSON :—“ When I entered the House this afternoon I had not the slightest intention of taking part in this debate. Not even the theatrical and vehement performance of the de facto Leader of the Congress Party drew me to my feet. I think we all recognize that he was ‘intoxicated with the exuberance of his own verbosity.’ After the sane speech of Mr. Kumarswami Reddi I would just like to say this. It is a great pity that so many hours have been wasted on a debate such as this only to learn that one leading party will remain neutral, and an other important party also would do the same. I would like to say on behalf of this bench that we are in favour of provincial autonomy (Hear, hear) with due safeguards. But in view of the unreal and insincere nature of this debate, if the motion is to be pressed to a division, this bench will vote against it.”

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—“ I shall only say a few words as to the remarks made by the nominated members on the other side. What I find among them is that they are really conscious that some great revolution in the matter of the constitution is at hand. Mr. Siva Raj spoke of Bolshevism being established in this Presidency. But if Bolshevism were to come to this country it won’t be from the higher classes. It will be from the classes to which my hon. Friend belongs (Hear, hear). Because how was Bolshevism established in Russia? It was not by the higher classes. It was by the depressed classes which correspond to the depressed classes in this country. If after having established Swaraj we repress the lower class surely we shall deserve the worst. If such a condition of things happens then Mr. Siva Raj or his descendants will first try to establish Bolshevism. Now what is our aim? A constitution has been drawn up by the leading members of our party and the most advanced constitution framed is that of Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar.

4-30 p.m. “ There is a general provision in it that representation should be given at the rate of at least one for two lakhs. Our friends of the depressed classes number about 6 millions in this Presidency. Now if all the six millions have one representative for every two lakhs, they will have 30 representatives in this Council, out of about 250 representatives of all classes in this Council. They will all be elected. As regards the franchise, it is for them to decide and it will be given to them according as they wish. But if they insist on separate electorates, surely nobody will force the reservation of seats. I am glad my Friend Mr. Arpudaswami on the other side voiced the best feelings of his community in noble language. We want provincial Swaraj for the whole of India and autonomy for the provinces. We shall confine ourselves to this presidency in voting on this motion. We are all agreed with the principles. It is well I think if the Mover of the motion would withdraw it as several points have been raised over this motion from different sections of the House which require calm consideration.”

The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :—“ Mr. President, Sir, in speaking on this motion, I do not propose to press further the protest against some unfortunate clerk being deprived of his emoluments in order to further the cause of provincial autonomy. Nor do I complain of this resolution being raised on this appropriation, because, of course, it is a legitimate opportunity for any member to raise the question on this grant.

“ My hon. Colleague the Revenue Member has been accused of giving the most cynical replies to the questions which were put to him as to what the attitude of the Government would be. May I say that we on this bench looked forward with considerable interest to this discussion, because undoubtedly the question of the future of Reforms in this Presidency is one

17th March 1928]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

which in all probability will come under our consideration, both individually and possibly collectively (Hear, hear), and I think we have listened to this debate this afternoon in the full expectation that from this debate we might gather valuable material which would aid us in forming our conclusions on this very important matter. I may say frankly, Sir, that I am somewhat disappointed in the result. I also thought that we should get a definition of provincial autonomy ; and when the hon. Member for the University twitted the mover of this reduction on the fact that he did not define his ideas about provincial autonomy, I thought I was going to get from the hon. Member for the University a definition of it for which I have long been seeking. While urging objections to the position taken by Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar, he entirely forgot to give his own definition ; and I am still in the dark as to what he implies by provincial autonomy. I had hoped for example that on an occasion of this kind I might have some light as to the conception which the hon. Member for the University has as to the relations which in future ought to exist, say, between the Provincial government and the Central government. I am very anxious to get information on that point, and to get suggestions which will help us in considering the measure when it comes before us. I have not heard one word to-day which went to elucidate that very important issue.

"Then, turning to the second point with which the motion deals, that is, the position of minorities we did get valuable information from the hon. Member for the University. He concedes in the first place that the depressed classes must have separate representation. As to the method of that representation, of course he had criticisms to make. I do not suppose any one in this House differs from him when he suggests that nomination is not the most satisfactory or the final method in achieving that object. But, to my knowledge, when the present constitution came into force, there was no possibility, or material from which electorates of the depressed classes could be formed. When that question is again examined, it may be found that sufficient progress has been made in the last nine years to enable such electorates to be formed in part or in whole. At any rate some progress has been made in the case of the depressed classes which might warrant the abandoning of the method of representation by nomination. Then, if I understood him aright, the position as regards other minorities is this, it is a matter which entirely rests with them; if they want separate representation under the constitution to be framed by the hon. Member for the University, they shall get it. That of course is a very valuable statement from him, and will be very useful material to myself and my Colleagues when we in turn have to consider that very important question.

"Then turning to the question of safeguards—a very important question of course—a small community may consider that a representation of one or two per cent in this House while a valuable privilege in itself is hardly equivalent to a safeguard. That of course again is a question for them. My hon. Friend Mr. Thomas may consider that political representation by itself is quite a sufficient safeguard for his community. On the other hand, when I tried to find from the speech of the hon. Member Mr. Satyamurti any definite idea as to any other safeguards that might be inserted in the new constitution for communities not so satisfied. I could find none. It was so vague that my hon. Colleagues and myself have to be left to our own resources in examining that question.

"Then again, turning to the members representing the depressed classes here to-day, he asked them to be satisfied with the assurance that he gave .

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

[17th March 1928]

them that if they would only trust him and his community all would be well. (Mr. Satyamurti: 'Trust in us'.) I may say it would be a great relief to any one who is in the slightest degree responsible for the shaping of the future of this country if that solution of a very important question could be adopted. Unfortunately, the greatest obstacle to its adoption is the hon. Member for the University himself. He never speaks, directly or indirectly, to the representatives of the depressed classes without rousing fierce indignation. I do not wonder at it. He speaks to them like a schoolmaster rating school boys with an arrogance bordering on contempt as if they had behaved impertinently in taking part in our debates and putting forward their views as if they had no business in any sense to claim equality even on the floor of this House. (A voice:—Question :.)

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"On a point of personal explanation, Sir. The hon. the Finance Member is entitled to quote me but not to misrepresent me. I challenge him to show any phrase in my speech in which I said directly or indirectly that those gentlemen who spoke on behalf of the depressed classes were impertinent or that they had no business to take part in the debates of this House."

The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"It is not what the hon. Member says, it is what can be implied from the hon. Member's tones. (Voices: 'Invention', 'Imagination'.) Yes, but hon. Members of this House understand and know well to what I refer. And the unfortunate thing is that this impression for which he is responsible is not confined to the hon. Member for the University; for he is regarded as speaking for the whole community from which he is drawn I can imagine nothing as more unfortunate especially on this issue connected with the depressed classes than that such an impression should be created as regards their attitude by the speeches of one of their own community."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"On a point of personal explanation, I ask my Friend the Finance Member to substantiate what he is charging me with. He deliberately misrepresents me as referring to the depressed classes representative as impertinent in speaking for their own class. Instead of answering me, he refers to my tone and his own inference, which is mischievous. (A voice: 'Perversion')."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member has got every right to put his own interpretation regarding the voice of another Member of the House. As to the inference drawn by the Finance Member regarding the effect of his speech on the community to which the representative of the University belongs, it cannot be a matter for personal explanation."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"With reference to my voice, may I submit that my voice is not my community's but what is given to me by my lungs?"

\* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"I have said that I regard it as most unfortunate because I feel sure that in these matters the hon. Member does not represent his community and if it were a question of my citing instances to the contrary I could cite them. Apparently there are individual members of the depressed classes who are not prepared to accept the assurances given by the hon. Member for the University as safeguards. I could have wished that they in their turn had been able to place before this House more clearly their definition of what they regard as safeguards. The amount of materials available for the consideration not only of the Government but of every Member of this House would then have been more valuable and more satisfactory. I can only hope that these Members will be given other opportunities for

17th March 1928]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

declaring their views or putting forward their opinions as to the nature of these safeguards. The only safeguard that has been mentioned in the debate—and here perhaps I may refer to the speech of the hon. Mr. Thomas—he said “ Why don’t you adopt my suggestions, you have a very large police force, at least 50 per cent of the depressed classes may be recruited to these subordinate ranks ? ”

Mr. D. THOMAS :—“ On a point of personal explanation, Sir, what I said was 50 per cent of the new constables to be selected may be taken from the depressed classes and not 50 per cent of the depressed classes.” (Opposition laughter).

\* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :—“ I don’t intend to quarrel with what the hon. Mr. Thomas said on that point. I know that he referred to fresh recruitments from the depressed classes. But the point is one of the safeguard which was referred to by the hon. Member for the University, namely, that the efficiency of the services must be maintained. That is the one safeguard to which he referred in the course of the day’s proceedings. I would ask, how is that safeguard going to work in the case of the depressed classes. Everyone knows that a head constable or a constable must have a certain amount of education. (Here Mr. Saldanha interrupted). There have been many complaints in the past might I remind the hon. Member from Mangalore, of the lack of education on the part of subordinate classes in the Police Department and we have been urged to see that better educated men are recruited to that department. It seems to me that the one safeguard which has been mentioned in the course of the day’s debate is the one safeguard that could prevent the proposal of the hon. Mr. Thomas from being put into execution, and I should have been glad if a really practical proposition had been put forward and that is that we should spend very much more money on behalf of the depressed classes in order that they might be educated so as to aspire to places not only in the Police department and not only to the subordinate appointments in the Police department but also to appointments in all departments and in all ranks. Then again, the hon. Member for the University informed the Members of the depressed classes that our interests in their welfare was of a very recent growth, that it came into birth with the arrival of the Simon Commission and would die down with its departure from these shores.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ On a point of personal explanation. Sir, I did not say it started with the arrival of the Simon Commission. I said that it would die with the Simon Commission and that it started with the starting of the reforms with their representatives here.”

\* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :—“ The question of the depressed classes and the establishment of the Labour Department was one that had been under the anxious consideration of the Government long before anything was known of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms. We had hoped against hope that the aims which we had in view might have been achieved by the operation of social forces and by the awakening and enlightenment and a spirit of sympathy on the part of the people of this country. But we found that it was no use hoping any longer that any substantial advance would thus be made and that is why finally Government determined that if the interests of the depressed classes were to be served, it was necessary to establish a separate department to work for them and that was done.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ After the reforms.”

[17th March 1928]

\* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :—“ It may be that we have not effected what the majority of this House would wish in respect of the expenditure on that department, but as hon. Members know, we have many claims upon us. I can also say that while we had many pressing demands for increased expenditure from various quarters of this House on other objects, the demand for increased expenditure in respect of the Labour Department has been of a somewhat fainter character. But, whatever may be our position, even if it be that we should stand here to-day in a white-sheet in that respect, what about the hon. Member for the University ? He has had during the last nine years unlimited opportunities for working for the depressed classes. Why could he not from his seat there come forward to urge their claims and demand money for them and use his vote in their case not to cut out money which is at present his invariable practice, but to demand more money to be spent on them.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ On a point of personal explanation, Sir, at budget time I can only cut off money, but I cannot vote for more money.”

\* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :—“ The hon. Member says he cannot do it, and yet for the last three days we have been sitting here listening to speeches full of demands that more money should be spent on this, on that, on irrigation and other objects. Where is the constitutional impediment to a member getting up and demanding that say half a crore should be placed at the disposal of the Government for the education of the depressed classes when members have demanded that larger sums should be spent on irrigation, etc. There is no impediment at all, Sir.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ We have demanded it (Voices from the Swarajist benches : ‘ What about Lalaji’s demand in the Assembly ? ’ )”

\* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :—“ It is not too late yet for the hon. Member to show his sympathy. We have discussed here to-day very important questions which have to be decided within a comparatively short period of time and if the hon. Member for the University wishes to press his views as to how the future constitution of the country should be regulated, if he wishes to show his practical sympathy for the depressed classes, let him come forward and take a hand in the framing of the future constitution. Let him rise now and say that he is prepared to come before the commission, which has been sent (Voices from the Swarajist benches : ‘ No, no, we have been denied our rights ’), and which has specially come to take evidence as to how the people and the various communities in this country should be represented, what safeguards are best suited to the interests of the minority communities, what can be done to give the depressed classes a proper status in the constitution and to wipe out their fears and apprehensions. Let him take the opportunity now. I have no doubt that one who holds such a high position in the party which he represents would be received with the utmost consideration and that his suggestions and proposals would be fully examined.” (Loud applause).

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—“ I do not press the motion, Sir.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn. The demand was then put to the House and carried.

The House adjourned to re-assemble at 11 a.m. on Monday, the 19th March 1928.

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,  
Secretary to the Legislative Council.